



DELHI UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

DELHI UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

CI No. 013:1C15.11 9

1150

Ac. No 18 294

Date of release for loan

This book should be returned on or before the date last stamped below. An overdue charge of 0.6 nP will be charged for each day the book is kept overtime.

--	--	--	--

THE Σ RHAPSODY OF THE ILIAD

ANNOTATED BY
ALEX PALLIS

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

EDINBURGH GLASGOW LEIPZIG NEW YORK

TORONTO MELBOURNE CAPE TOWN BOMBAY

CALCUTTA MADRAS SHANGHAI

LONDON HUMPHREY MILFORD

1930

Printed in Great Britain

IN this edition I follow again the principle that in the homeic epics tribrachs and iambs, wherever placed, were admitted as dactyls and spondees, how this was possible I have explained at length in my edition of the *X* rhapsody. In the present commentary ample corroborative evidence I believe is produced.

As regards textual alterations and critical or exegetical remarks, I am entirely responsible for all those respecting which no reference is made to previous works.

Darwin was much puzzled by the slowness with which new ideas were absorbed. But that was not an unusual phenomenon. Every one who had tried to persuade his colleagues to accept a new theory of knowledge as the interpretation of an otherwise incomprehensible mass of evidence must have realized the rarity of success in inducing them dispassionately to consider, much less to accept his suggestion.

PROFESSOR ELLIOT SMITH in
the Huxley Memorial Lecture
for 1928

ΙΛΙΑΔΟΣ Σ

Σ

Ὡς οἱ μὲν μάρναντο πυρὸς μένε' αἰθομένοιο
 Ἀντίλοχος δ' Ἀχιλλεὶ πόδας ταχὺς ἄγγελος ἦλθε

1 Versum ab eo qui carmen in rhapsodias disposuit interpolatum esse facile conicias HEYNE. An unnecessary supposition The verse, as in A596, is a connecting link, and such links are frequently interwoven both in poetry and in prose. They sound natural and pleasant, as if a person paused and reflected how next to proceed with his narrative Cf 148 τὴν μὲν ἄρ' Ὀλυμπόνδε πόδες φέρον 368 ὥς οἱ μὲν τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγόρευον A318 ὥς οἱ μὲν τὰ πένοντο κατὰ στρατόν E84 ὥς οἱ μὲν πονέοντο (read ἐπένοντο) κατὰ κρατερὴν ὑσμίνην Z312 ὥς αἱ μὲν ῥ' εὗχοντο Διὸς κούρῃ I1 ὥς οἱ μὲν Τρῶες φυλακὰς ἔχον M1 ὥς ὁ μὲν ἐν κλισίῃσι (perhaps κλισίῃφι) Μενοτίου ἄλκιμος ὕδς ἰέετο Εὐρύπυλον 34 ὥς ἄρ' ἐμελλον ὀπισθε Ποσειδάων καὶ Ἀπόλλων θησέμεναι ζ1 ὥς ὁ μὲν ἐνθα καθεῦδε Thuc 1-129 τοσαῦτα μὲν ἡ γραφὴ ἐδήλου 7-16 ἡ μὲν τοῦ Νικίου ἐπιστολὴ τοσαῦτα ἐδήλου 7-25 καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐν τῇ Σικελίᾳ ταῦτ' ἐπρασσον 7-34 καὶ ἡ μὲν ναυμαχία οὕτως ἐτελεύτα Herod 1-71 κατὰ μὲν νυν τὸν κρητῆρα οὕτως ἔσχε And numerous other examples

ὥς The distinction between ὥς and ὅς made by the ancient grammarians and discussed at length by Lehrs at p 368ff is of the hair-splitting character The adverb is ὥς, but when its tenor is not *as* but *so* and it is desirable to indicate its stress, all that we need do is to add an acute accent To write ὅς in any context seems to me superfluous

μάρναντο πυρὸς μένε' αἰθομένοιο To this leads the variant πυρὸς μένος, preserved in the Mss H and Ud The combination πυρὸς μένος is encountered in P565 Ψ238 Ω792, Bacchyl.Epin 3-53 Cf also Apoll Rhod 1-1026 σὺν δ' ἔλασαν μελίας ὀξείῃ ἵκελοι ριπῇ πυρός O605 μαίνεται

ὥς ὅτ' ὁλοὸν πῦρ μαίνεται For μάραντο μένει cf H210 μένει μάχεσθαι. Thus we obtain an admirably poetical image *they fought with the fury of a blazing fire*. On the other hand, the reading δέμας πυρός, so far universally adopted, is highly unsatisfactory. It recurs in A596 and the two spurious verses N673 and P366, where δέμας is supposed to signify *like* (Scholia πυρός τρόπον), but it is strange that a word of so common an import should have been employed only in a single phrase, which itself really figures but twice, nor is it clear by what process it could have evolved into the sense of *like*.

2 Ἀχιλεῖ Payne Knight Ἀχιλεῖ, see his Prolegomena § civ Mss Ἀχιλῆι. See notes on vv 214 38 60 134 327 402 486. The primitive suffix of words in -εὺς (as well as of those in -ης of the third declension, see note on v 134) was of course -έφι, which after the retreat of the digamma became -έι, the one in -ῆι, which we now find so preponderatingly in our texts, is fictitious and was intended to meet false metrical notions. See note on v 76. We possess abundant evidence for the genuine suffix in Ἀμαρυγκέα Ἀμαρυγκείδης Ἀτρεός Ἀτρείδης Ἀτρείωνος Αὐγείας (read Αὐγείης) Βουδείφ Δωριέες γονέων (Hymn Dem 240) Ἰφεία Καινέα Καινείδαο Μηκιστέος Μινυέιον Νηλέα Νηλείδαο Οδυσέος (Δ491) Οἰνείδεο Ὀτρυντείδην Ἠηλέος Πηλείδης Πηλείονος Πολυθερσείδης Πρωτέος Τυδέος Τυδείδης Φυλέος Φυλείδης ὕεος τοκέων. The tendency to lapse into -ῆι is revealed by the fact that, in spite of the above instances, we likewise find Αὐγυιάδαο (but Ub Αὐγείδαο in B624) Μηκιστηιάδης Μινυήιος Νηληῖος Νηληιάδαο Ὀδυσῆος Ὀτρυντηῖ Πηληῖος Πηληιάδαο Φυλῆα τοκῶν. The last example is particularly instructive in that, whereas we find twenty-eight cases of τοκῶν and they are all rhythmically susceptible of the alteration into τοκέων, the two cases of τοκέων (O660 Φ587) resist any interference. The case in favour of -έι is further strengthened by the declension of the adjectives which end in -ύς.

As regards Ἀχιλεὺς, if we take the dative as an illustration, we find that out of forty-five passages the following seven only need a deeper alteration than that of η into ε, say

- (1) Ω176 196 119 δῶρα δ' Ἀχιλλῆι φερέμεν. The corruption is mani-

Τὸν δ' εὔρε προπάροιθε νεῶν ὀρθοκραιράων
τὰ φρονέοντ' ἀνὰ θυμὸν ἂ δὴ τετελέσμενα ρ' ἦεν
Ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα ρεῖπε πρὸς ὃν μεγαλήτορα θυμὸν

5

fest from the fact that *η* occurs in the thesis Read Ἀχιλῆι πορέμεναι ,
cf Φ80 ἐλύμην τρίς τόσα πορών

(2) Ω110 τόδε κῦδος Ἀχιλλῆι προτιάπτω The context requires τόδε
κῆδος Ἀχιλῆι οὐ ποτ' ἰάψω, *never shall I cause Achilles this grief*

(3) Υ376 Ἀχιλλῆι προμάχιζε Here again *η* occurs in the thesis
The verse in fact is spurious

(4) Π121 αἶ κεν νέκυν Ἀχιλλῆι προφέρωμεν A deeply corrupt phrase,
for προφέρωμεν is unsuitable and *η* appears in the thesis

(5 and 6) Ν324 οὐδ' ἂν Ἀχιλλῆι ῥηξήνορι and Π575 οἱ δ' ἄμ' Ἀχιλλῆι
ῥηξήνορι Both these passages are in spurious parts and exhibit *η* in
the thesis

(7) Α283 λίσσομ' Ἀχιλλῆι μεθέμεν χόλον Again we find *η* in the
thesis Read Ἀχιλῆι μεθέμεναι

A few other suggestions may be made here (1) ο233 Νηλῆος
κούρης, read Νηλείης κούρης, cf Β20 Νηλείω νῆι (?) (2) Π175 Πηλῆος
θυγάτηρ, read Πηλείη θυγάτηρ. (3) Ε386 Ἀλωῆος δῆσαν, read Ἀλωῆος
ἔδησαν (4) ζ266 Ποσιδῆιον, read Ποσιδώνιον (5) Ζ299 Κισσηῖς ἄλοχος,
read Κισσεῖη ἄλοχος (6) μ272 μαντήια, read μαντία

3 to 16 A seniore rhapsodo [vel grammatico] interpositos esse
idem vir doctus [Heyne] quoque sensit Achilles enim intra tento-
rium ad focum sedebat (24), ita ut Graecos ἀνυζόμενους πεδίοιο videre
non posset, et a praecedentibus et sequentibus perinde constat eum
de sua tantum morte a matre praemonitum esse, neque notitiam
vel suspicionem ullam in animo habuisse, Patroclum se vivo mori-
turum Minoris est momenti quod rhapsodus interpolator oblitus
sit Patroclum Locrum ex Opounte, non Myrmidonem, fuisse, neque
mirum est Achillem ei foris sedisse visum esse, quum postea δμῶαι
ἐκ θυραῖς ἐδραμον ἀμφ' Ἀχιλλῆα (28-30), ejusmodi enim hominis,
morum antiquorum parum docti, non erat animadvertere eas e
conclavi interiore, mulieribus proprio, in viorum contubernium

exuisse. PAYNE KNIGHT. Though Achilles's foreboding enhances the dramatic effect of this scene and one is sorry to part with it, still it is impossible to gainsay the cogency of Payne Knight's indictment. The accretion, however, dates from those times when the epic genius had not yet exhausted itself, nor had the digamma entirely retreated. The ancient critics pedantically found nothing objectionable in these verses beyond the trivial fact, as pointed out by Payne Knight, that Patroklos is called a Myrmidon whereas he was an Opountian, and that is why only vv 10 and 11, as Didymos informs us, 'ἐν τῇ Ῥιανοῦ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνους οὐκ ἦσαν'

3 προπάραιθε See note on v 531

ὀρθοκραίων An epithet as applied to ships borrowed from T344, where I conceive it is a misreading of ὀρθοπρωράων. The corruption was occasioned by the fact that ὀρθοκραίων occurs elsewhere as an attribute of cattle (see however note on v 573) with the meaning of *upright-horned*, and it was supposed that the opposite curved ends of a ship resembled the horns of an ox. But in this way we must presume that the poet viewed the side of a ship, and not its bow, as resembling a forehead. This I nowise believe.

4 τὰ φρονέοντ' ἀνὰ θυμὸν ἃ δὴ τετελεσμένα ρ' ἦεν The dative as in v. 74 τὰ μὲν δὴ τοι τετέλεσται and v 79 τὰ μὲν ἄρ μοι Ὀλύμπιος ἐξετέλεσε. Cf also v 61 ὅφρα δέ μοι ζώει. For its position cf. ρ592 ἄγχι σχῶν κεφαλὴν ἵνα μὴ πειθοιάτῳ ρ' ἄλλοι (Mss πειθοιάθ' οἱ ἄλλοι) φ50 πετάσθησαν δέ ροι ὦκα. E748 and Θ392 ἐπεμαιετό ρ' (Mss ἐπεμαίετ' ἄρ') ἵππους. The Mss τετελεσμένα ἦεν with an intolerable hiatus, to obviate which Heyne conjectured τὸ φρονέοντ' ἀνὰ θυμὸν ὃ δὴ τετελεσμένον ἦεν, remarking 'ut A212, toties alibi'. But Leaf objected with obvious reason that thus the cause of the corruption is left unexplained, the tendency being always the exact opposite, viz to remove the hiatus even where it is legitimate.

5 ὀχθήσας I have noted at λ98 that a person who exclaims οἶμοι or ὦμοι does not ὀχθεῖν but οἰμώζειν.

ῤεῖπε πρὸς ὃν μεγαλήτορα θυμὸν This represents Achilles not as speaking within himself but as if he were engaged in a colloquy

ὦμοι ἐγὼ, τί τ' ἄρ' αὔτε κερηκομόωντες Ἀχαιοὶ
 νηυσὶν ἐπὶ κλονέονται ἀτυζόμενοι πεδίοιο,
 Μὴ δὴ μοι τελέσῃσι θεοὶ κακὰ κήδεα θυμῷ,
 ὥς ποτέ μοι μήτηρ διεπέφραδε καὶ μοι ἔρειπε
 Μυρμιδόνων τὸν ἄριστον ἐπὶ ζώοντος ἐμῆιο
 χερσὶν ὑπο Τρώων λείψειν φάος ἡελίοιο 10
 Ἡ μάλα δὲ τέθηκε Μενoitίου ἄλκιμος υἱὸς
 σχέτλιος / ἥ τ' ἐκέλευον ἀπώσάμενον δῆμον πῦρ
 νῆας ἔπ' ἄψ' ἰέναι μηδ' Ἑκτορι ρῖφι μάχεσθαι
 Ἔως ὃ ταῦθ' ὤρμαινε κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν,
 τύφρα ροὶ ἐγγύθεν ἦλθεν ἀγαθοῦ Νέστορος υἱός, 15

with his own mind. It contains besides two rhythmical faults, the vowels before *πρὸς* and *ὄν* (*ρὸν*) not being lengthened. The phrase is found several times, and probably in every case it should be altered to *ἔειπε οἱ ἔρεπε κατὰ* (as in v. 15), *οἱ* more probably *ἔειπεν* or *ἔρεπεν* *ἀνὰ* *μεγαλήτορα* *θυμόν*, cf. Ω680 *ὀρμαίνοντ' ἀνὰ θυμόν*. All these flaws, however, may be due to the interpolator.

6 to 16. Were these verses truly homeric, instead of *κερηκομόωντες*, *ἔρειπε*, τὸν *ἄριστον*, ἐμῆιο, *Μειοιτίου*, υἱός, δῆμον, νῆας ἔπ' ἄψ' ἰέναι, and ἔως ὃ, I should read *κερηκομόεντες* (see note on v. 144), *ἔρεπε* (94), perhaps *ἐν' ἄριστον* (10), ἐμέο (358), *ἡελίοιο* (61), *Μενoitίου* (93), υἱός (76 and 458), δάμον (13), ἄψ' νέας ἔπ' ἰμεναι or νέας ἔπ' ἄψ' ἰναι (14), and probably *ὄφρ' ὅ γε*.

10 τὸν *ἄριστον*. In a genuinely homeric verse the article would be out of place. Homer would probably have written *ἐν' (= ἐνα) ἄριστον*, the numeral enhancing still further the superlative, as in M243 *εἰς οἰωνὸς ἄριστος*. Of this idiom Blaydes has collected numerous examples at Soph. OC 563. The same is its force in Xen. An. 2-6-1 *εἰς μὲν αὐτῶν Κλέαρχος ἐκ πάντων δόξας γενέσθαι ἀνὴρ καὶ πολεμικὸς καὶ φιλοπόλεμος ἐσχάτως*. I may add that in Mark 8-28 *εἰς τῶν προφητῶν* equally means *the one prophet, the greatest of all prophets*. In Arist. Plut. 105 for *ἐν' ἄνδρα* read *ἐν' ἄνδρα*.

12 *Μενoitίου*. Homerically *Μενoitίου*. See notes on vv. 325 and 455.

13 ἡ τ' ἐκέλευον Blandreth ἡ ρ' ἐκέλευον, and this homerically would certainly be the right reading

δῆιον Homerically δάιον For, as the first syllable is very frequently met with in the thesis, it must be short Cf δαί δαίζω δαικταμένων, words which probably come from the same root It follows that we must likewise write δαιοτῆς δαιώ Δαικῶν Δαιοπίτης Δαίοχος Δαίπυλος Δαίπυρος Δαίφοβος In 1243 read δαίειν for δηώσειν, 11650 δαίξῃ for δηώσῃ, M227 δαίωσιν for δηώσωσιν, 534 δαίξας (see note on v 83) for δηώσας, 518 δαίξας for δηώσας, 1158 δαίξαντες for δηώσαντες, 416 Τρῶας μὲν δαμάσωσιν for Τρῶας δηώσωσιν, 417 δαμασθέντων, with an iamb in the fifth foot, for δηωθέντων, 166 δαμασθέντες (cf. 59 δαμάσαντες) for δηωθέντες The lengthening as in ἡέλιος (note on v 61) ἡεμέοις ἡνυόφανος (note on v 505) ἡύκομος etc Refer also to note on v 77 Brandreth also writes δαιον

14 νῆας ἔπ' ἄψ ἰέναι From Didymos's scholion ' ἐν ἐνίαις δὲ φαύλως νῆας ἔπ' ἄψ ἰέναι' we learn that this reading was pretty extensively followed, and it is preferable, the common reading ἄψ ἐπὶ νῆας ἵμεν looks like a levelling of the phrase

νῆας The genuine homeric form is νέας, see note on v 260

ἰέναι A papyrus fragment gives ἵναι, which I think is truly homeric as an alternative form to ἵμεναι; cf. ἕμεναι-εἶναι δόμεναι-δοῦναι δύμεναι-δύναι θέμεναι-θεῖναι μιγέμεναι (Mss μιγήμεναι, but cf. 375 ιγχεμέναι 307 τετλάμεναι)-μιγῆναι στάμεναι (Mss στήμεναι)-στήναι ἀλέμεναι (Mss ἀλήμεναι)-ἀλῆναι In later times, as we learn from Phrynichos's remark, ἀπίναι προσίναι ἐξίναι καπίναι were freely used, but ἵναι in these compounds must have evolved through a new process, for the accent shows the iota to be short whereas in Homer it is long In 425 διδοῦναι is a hideous barbarism, adopted by editors in spite of διδόναι being amply attested

15 Transferred bodily from A193 along with its atrocious deformity of ἔως ὃ as a legitimate foot

16 ἀγαυοῦ Νέστορος υἱός Nowhere else is Nestor called ἀγανός, and it may be that the interpolator's reading was Νέστορος ἀγλαός υἱός as in K196 Ψ302 821 303 04, cf further γ190 Παιάντιον ἀγλαόν

δάκρυα θερμὰ χέων, φάτο δ' ἀγγελίην ἀλεγεινὴν
 ὦμοι, Πηλέος υἱὲ δαΐφρονος, ἣ μάλα λυγρῆς
 πεύσσαι ἀγγελίης, ἣ μὴ ὠφέλε γενέσθαι
 Κεῖται Πάτροκλος, νέκυος δὲ δὴ ἀμφιμάχονται 20
 γυμνοῦ· ἀτὰρ τεὰ τεύχε' ἔχει κορυθαίολος Ἔκτωρ
 ὦς φάτο, τὸν δ' ἄχεος νεφέλη ἐκάλυψε μέλαινα,
 ἀμφοτέρησι δὲ χερσὶν ἑλὼν κόνιν αἰθαλόεσσαν
 χέατο κακ' κεφαλῆς, χαρίεν δ' ἥσχυνε πρόσωπον·
 νεκταρίῳ δὲ χιτῶνι μέλαιν' ἀμφίζανε τέφρη 25
 Αὐτὸς δ' ἐν κονίῃσι μέγας μεγαλωστί ταυνοθεῖς
 κεῖτο, φίλησι δὲ χερσὶ κόμην ἥσχυνε δαΐζων

ῥόν Probably also in 8365 Πρωτίος ἰφθίμου θυγάτηρ should be Πρω-
 τέος ἰφθίμη θυγάτηρ, cf κ106 θυγατέρ' ἰφθίμη Λαιστρυγόνος, but on the
 other hand λ85 Αὐτολύκου θυγάτηρ μεγάλῃτορος

19 μὴ ὠφέλε So also in the parallel passage P686 Most editors
 prefer the variant ὠφέλλε, a form which on the face of it is pseudo-
 metrical Nauck conjectured ὠφέλε in accordance with the variant
 at X481 But this is the imperfect, what we require is the aorist,
 which is either ὠφελον or without augment ὄφελον Cf Ω253 αἶθ'
 ἅμα πάντες Ἐκτορος ὠφέλετ' ἄντι πεφάσθαι and Ω764 ὥς πρὶν ὠφελον
 (a variant ὠφέλλον) ὀλέσθαι In all passages where the form ὄφελον
 occurs that with a single λ is admissible except at 8472 ἀλλὰ μάλ'
 ὠφέλλες, which probably once read ἀλλ' ἄρα μάλ' ὄφελες (T96 τ283
 x91)

21 τεὰ The Mss τά γε The article of course is inadmissible and
 the addition of γε (= at least) falsifies the context.

24 χέατο Mss χεύατο, the υ being epenthetic as in ἐπιδευομένους
 (77) ἀχεύων (461) ὠρχεῖντο (594) ἐδίνεον (606) νηπιαχέων οἰνοχοέων
 ταλαύρινον λανκανίη (see my note on X325) Payne Knight χεύσατο,
 but the imperfect is much more probable in accordance with the
 following ἥσχυνε I may add that in ταυαύποδα (ι464) it is the alpha
 which is epenthetic

κακ' κεφαλῆς The apocope in κατὰ may be illustrated by that in

παρὰ and ἀνά. But it is strange that we find no similar apocope in μετά. This makes me think that we have before us not an apocope but a syncope, such as I have pointed out in my note on ν 47, and that κατὰ κεφαλῆς having been felt as one word was shortened into κὰ κεφαλῆς. And this is actually the reading of one Ms. I should say that a syncope exists also in κὰκ κορυφὴν κάββαλον κὰδ-δὲ κακκείοντες κάλλιπε καλλύσαι κάμμορον κάππεσε καρρέζουσα κάθανε κατθάψαι κάτθεσαν ὑββάλλειν, the origin of all of which I presume was a desire to form dactyls and spondees. I have come across two indications in support: (1) Δ702 κάσχεθε, where no alternative κάτοσχεθε exists; (2) φ86 κατείβετο, which must be an error for καλείβετο = καταλείβετο, since the verb is λείβω (cf. λουβῆ) and not εἴβω, though the latter disfigures our texts in several places.

χαρίεν δ' ἦσχυε πρόσωπον. Everywhere else we encounter only the plural, except that in σ173 the singular exists as a variant, besides, the short vowel before πρ is suspect. Most likely μέτωπον, so Π798 χαρίεν τε βέτωπον.

25 νεκταρίῳ δὲ χιτῶνι. Mss νεκταρέω, as also in Γ385. But adjectives formed with the suffix -εος are what the grammarians call μετουσιαστικά, i.e. they indicate materials, cf. χάλκεος ἀργύρεος σιδήρεος χρύσεος, in Attic χαλκοῦς ἀργυροῦς etc. In our homeric texts -εος is often fixed to roots unconnected with materials, so B54 Νεστορέη παρὰ νεί, Θ113 Νεστορέας ἵππους (whereas Δ597 Νηλείαι ἵπποι), Ψ525 ἵππου τῆς Ἀγαμέμνονός, Ω276 Ἑκτορέης κεφαλῆς, Ε745 ὄχρα φλόγεια, Ψ177 πυρὸς μένος σιδίρειον. To all such adjectives the suffix -ιος should be restored. And similarly in Hes. Her. 104 we should read Ταύριο Ἐνοσίγαιος and not ταύρεος as is exhibited by the Mss. In Bacchyl. Epin. 12-154 Ἑκτορέας no doubt should stand, as it must have been taken from the homeric text-books after their deprecation. The suffix -έιος is frequently but an alternative one to -εος, cf. χρυσέιος, therefore for ἄμαξαν ἡμιονείην in Ω189 we should restore ἡμιονίην with an iambic end.

26 and 27. Verses athetized by Duntzer, they certainly do not accord with ν 33 χεῖρας ἔχων Ἀχλῆος.

Δμωαὶ δ', ἄς Ἀχιλεὺς ληίσατο Πάτροκλός τε,
 θυμὸν ἀκηχεμέναι μέγα ρίαχον, ἐκ δὲ θύραζε
 ἔδραμον ἀμφ' Ἀχιλῆα δαΐφρονα, χερσὶ δὲ πᾶσαι
 στήθεα πεπλήγοντο, λύθεν δ' ὑπο γύα ρεκάσσης
 Ἀντίλοχος δ' ἐτέρωθεν ὀδύρετο δάκρυα λείβων,
 χεῖρας ἔχων Ἀχιλῆος ὃ δ' ἔστεινε κυδάλιμον κήρ
 δεῖδιε γὰρ μὴ λαιμὸν ἀπαμήσειε σιδῆρῳ

Σμερδαλέον δ' ὦμωξεν, ἄκουσε δὲ πότνια μήτηρ,
 ἡμένη ἐν βένθεσιν ἀλὸς παρὰ πατρὶ γέροντι,

28 δμωαί Often written δμωαί But whence the iota subscript, considering that the root is δμω(ς)? An identical blunder in Τρωαί In our Mss we constantly meet with such intrusive iotas, so v 57 ἀλωῆς 291 Μηριόνη A41 κρήνην 383 θνήσκον 397 ἔφησθα B38 ἦδη 93 δεδήει 138 ἀκράαντον Ω167 μιμησκόμεναι, etc

ληίσ(σ)ατο Probably ἐλίσ(σ)ατο This root, supported by I408 οὔτε λεισται as well as the Attic λεία, is everywhere admissible except K460 Ἀθηναίῃ (probably Ἀθηνεῖν) ληίτιδι δῖος Ὀδυσ(σ)εύς, ο427 Τάφιοι ληίστορες ἄνδρες, ψ357 αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ληίσ(σ)ομαι Nor is there any legitimate place for the second σ, which so persistently pops up everywhere See note on v 36

29 θυμὸν ἀκηχεμέναι The formation of this perfect participle could be accounted for as follows Just as ἀλείφω, subjected to augment and reduplication, makes ἀληλιμμένος, so ἀκαχέω by the same process would produce ἀκηκαχέμενος, this, in order to avoid the cacophony resulting from a succession of the same guttural, would be syncopated into ἀληχεμένος, see note on v 47 And the accent as a matter of course would then fall upon the penultimate, and not upon the antepenultimate which is the accentuation of the present tense With θυμὸν ἀκηχεμέναι and E364 ἀκηχεμένη φίλον ἦτορ cf. Ω437 φίλον τετιημέναι ἦτορ

μέγα ρίαχον So Bekker, Heyne having preceded with μέγα ρίραχον Mss μεγάλ' ἰαχον See also note on v 228.

30 Ἀχιλῆα Mss Ἀχιλῆα See note on v 2

31 γυῖα Cf ἀμφίγυος, ἀμφίγυήεις (read ἀμφίγυνόεις). The Mss γυῖα with an iota which, as in υῖος (see note on v 76), is only metrical. The short syllable is everywhere admissible. In Z265 for ἀπογυνώσῃς read ἀπογυνώσῃς, replacing the false spondee by an iamb.

34 Condemned by Bentley. Leaf 'one would be glad to think that Antilochos holds Achilles' hands out of affectionate sympathy, and that this is an explanatory line by a man too dull to understand such an action.' It is hardly worth while discussing further its objectionable character, beyond adding that, since no possessive or reflexive pronoun accompanies the active verb, the interpolator should have said ἀπαμύσσαιτο.

35 σμερδαλέον δ' ᾤμωξεν If Homer himself is responsible for σμερδαλέον, it does not seem that this time the supreme bard made use of the proper term, for this verb breathes a tone of savagery, suitable for instance in the case of a Cyclops (2395), but not as a passionate cry of pain, such as a person in Achilles' anguish would utter. Perhaps στεντόριον, the word is not found in Homer, which is surprising, as at E785 he chose the name Στέντωρ for the giant whose voice equalled that of fifty men. Probably σμερδαλέον is also wrong in 92 p542.

36 βένθεσιν So several documents both here and at A358, but all editors, so far as I know, prefer the variant βίνθεσιν. There are numerous passages where only the form in -εσι is admissible, as vv 430 A77 150 211 297 B73 Z418, etc. Again, almost always where we find the suffix -εσσι the one in -εσι is metrically legitimate, and is very often backed by Mss authority. Cf 233 352 555 A42 83 223 Z141 183, etc. There ought to exist no doubt that -εσσι is but a clumsy rhythmical expedient. It is a fact that it appears in inscriptions, but too much importance need not be attached to this, the double σ became an orthographical tradition derived from the homeric text-books, and was even admitted into such words as ρασσῶν ραλίσσεται νοοσς (νοῦς). Amanuenses greatly affected it, so that in our texts we find A317 κνίσση Z82

κώκυσεν δ' ἄν' ἔπειτα· θεαὶ δέ μιν ἀμφαγέροντο,
 πᾶσαι ὄσαι κατὰ βένθος ἀλὸς Νηρεΐδες ἦσαν.
 Ἐνθ' ἄρ' ἔην Γλαύκη θ' Ἐφάλειά τε Κυμοδόκη τε,
 Νησαίη Σπείω τε Θόη θ' Ἀλὶή τε βοῶπις, 40
 Κυμοθόη τε καὶ Ἀκταίη καὶ Λιμνώρεια
 καὶ Μελίη καὶ Ἰαίρα καὶ Ἀμφιθόη καὶ Ἀγανὴ
 Δωτώ τε Πρωτώ τε Φέρουσά τε Δυναμένη τε
 Δεξαμένη τε καὶ Ἀμφινόμη καὶ Καλλιάνειρα,
 Δωρίς καὶ Πανόπη καὶ ἀγακλειτὴ Γαλάτεια, 45
 Νημερτὴς τε καὶ Ἀψευδὴς καὶ Καλλιάνασσα

πεσσίειν 243 αἰθούσσησι 244 ἔνεσαν, and numerous similar monstrosities So also does Oxyi Pap 1391, which records Δ635, give πυθμένεσς It is no more rational to suppose that Homer at one time said βένθεσσι and at another βένθεσι than that a Tuscan would at one time say *velo bel la* and at another *vel-lo bela* See also notes on vv 28 and 174

37 κώκυσεν δ' (so a papyrus, nearly all other documents τ') ἄν' ἔπειτα, 1 θ ἀνεκώκυσεν δ' ἔπειτα, *wailed loudly* So also at Ω703 Foi ἀνακωκύω see Liddell and Scott, cf further from Homer ἀνέβραχε ἀναρροιβδέω ἀναστειάζω ἀνακραζώ ἀμφιαχυῖαν (B316) ἀμβληδὴν Mss κώκυσεν τ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα A similar corruption of ἀνὰ into ἄρα in v 503

38 Νηρεΐδες See note on v 2 The Mss both here and at v 52 give Νηρηΐδες, but a papyrus fragment -ειδες at v 49 seems to have preserved the primitive reading

39 to 49 Condemned with one accord by both ancient and modern critics But the first three lines, which appear only to include maritime names, should not be summarily rejected On the contrary, as in the parallel case of θ111 to 116, the presentation of distinct figures in the group of the Nereids lends life to the picture, and by their suppression we reduce a vivid beauty to a generality Had these lines been spurious, the names would not have been all maritime but a mixture of maritime and non-

maritime ones similar to that of the imitative passage in Hes Theog 243ff.

39 $\xi\nu\theta'$ ἄρ' $\xi\eta\nu$ A double flaw, for $\xi\eta\nu$ instead of $\xi\epsilon\nu$ or $\eta\epsilon\nu$ is ungrammatical, and ἄρα being a synonym of $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha$ is obviously unsuitable. An alteration to $\xi\nu\theta\alpha$ δ' $\epsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$ is very easy, but I think it more likely that these words have supplanted the name of a Nereid. Out of the names enumerated by Hesiod Ἡϊόνη would suit best, in fact, to create a name from $\eta\iota\omega\nu$ would I fancy have at once suggested itself to Homer.

Γλαύκη θ' Ὑφάλειά τε The Mss Γλαύκη τε Θάλειά τε; but Θάλεια is not a maritime name.

40 and 41 Νησαίη and Ἀκταίη The Mss Νησαίη and Ἀκταίη with non-homeric contractions.

40 Σπείω So Nauck Mss Σπειώ See note on γ 402.

Θόη A name suggested by quick rowing. Or perhaps Σπείω τ' Ὀχθώ.

Θόη θ' Ἀλή τε So Aristarchos instead of θοῇ Θαλή τε.

41 Κυμοθήη For this name closely following Κυμοδόκη see Lehrs p 458, who points out the succession of names from ἀλς and ναῦς in θ111ff.

Λιμνώρεια. One Ms Πρηνώρεια. Qu Λιμνάκρεια or rather Λιμνήκρεια.

43 Δωτώ A μοῖρα who, like Πρωτώ and Φέρουσα, bestows gifts upon a new-born child. In a genuine verse its form would have been Δωτώ, as in fact it exists in one Ms, cf δωτήρ, δέδοται.

Πρωτώ Its derivation from πρὸ-πρώτος is erroneous, its root is πορ (ἐπορον), cf πέπρωται. Cf Soph OC 145 μοίρας πρωτῆς. The masculine Πρωτεὺς of 8385 is probably an error for Τριτεὺς.

Δυναμένη Probably Πανομένη as another μοῖρα who beneficently busies herself at a childbirth.

44 Καλλιάνειρα I suspect that in all genuine passages feminine names in -ιάνειρα should be altered into -ήνειρα after the numerous masculines in -ήνωρ. It is clear that in Καστιάνειρα and Κυδιάνειρα the iota is unaccountable.

46 Νημερτής τε καὶ Ἀψευδής Heyne Νημερτίς τε (one Ms Νημέρτις) καὶ Ἀψευδής, probably right.

ἔνθα δ' ἔην Κλυμένη' Ἰάνειρά τε καὶ Ἰάνασσα,
 Μαῖρα καὶ Ὀρείθνια ἐνπλόκαμός τ' Ἀμάθνια,
 ἄλλαι θ' αἱ κατὰ βένθος ἄλδος Νηρηίδες ἦσαν
 Πᾶν δ' ἐν ἄρα γλαφυρὸν πλήτο σπέος. Αἱ δ' ἅμα πᾶσαι 50
 στήθεα πεπλήγοντο, Θέτις δ' ἐξήρχε γόοιο
 Κλύτε, κασίγνηται Νηρείδες, ὄφρ' εὖ πᾶσαι
 ρεΐδετ' ἀκούουσαι ὅσ' ἐμῶ ἐνὶ κήδεα θυμῶ.
 "Ὡμοι ἐγὼ δρῆιλῃ, ὦμοι δυσαριστοτόκεια,
 ἦ τ' ἐπεὶ ἄρ τέκον ὕδν ἀμύμονά τε κρατερόν τε, 55
 ἔξοχον ἡρώων, ὃ δ' ἀνέδραμεν ἔρνει ρίσος,

47 Ἰάνειρά τε καὶ Ἰάνασσα Their primitive forms must have been *Ἰήνερα* (see note on v 44), syncopated from *Ἰιφήνερα* (ῥίφι + ἄνηρ), and *Ἰιάνασσα*, syncopated from *Ἰιφιράνασσα* (ῥίφι + ῥάναξ) Analogous syncopations are Ἀγήνωρ-Ἀγανήνωρ αἰμόφυρκτος-αἱματούφυρκτος αἱμακουρία (Bacchyl Epin 7) -αἱματοκουρία αἰπόλος-αἰγοπόλος αἰσιμος-αἰνέσιμος ἀκηχεμένος-ἀκηχαχέμενος ἡλίβατος (ἀλίβατος)-ἀλιτόβατος Ἀκιμέδων-Ἀλκιμομέδων ἀλκτήρ-ἀλεξητήρ ἄσπετος-ἀθέσφατος (see note on v 165) Δημήτηρ-Δημομήτηρ Ἐκάβη-Ἐκατόμβη (*worth a hundred or numerous head of cattle*) Ἐκτωρ-Ἐκατόγκτωρ (cf Πολύκτωρ) ἔρανῆς (ἐρανῆς ?)-ἐρατεινῆς ἐρεμνός-ἐρεβεινός Εὐρυσθεὺς (read Ἐρισθεὺς, see my note on v 398)-ἐρισθενῆς ἕξαιτος-ἐξαίρετος γυναιμανῆς-γυναικομανῆς Θεόστωρ-Θειίστωρ κάμαξ-καλάμαξ (see Eustath at v 563) κελαινεφῆς κελαινονεφῆς (κελαινοβαφῆς ?) κρῆ (rather κρή)-κάρη Κυμοθόη-Κυματοθύη Λαέρτης (read Λαήρτης)-Λαηγέρτης λωποδύτης-λωπαποδύτης ὅσιος ὀδόσιος παστὰς-παραστὰς Πέλωψ-Πενρέλωψ (cf Πηνελόπεια) Πολύκτωρ-Πολυκτῆτωρ Πολυποῖτης-Πολυποινίτης πρόμος-πρόμαχος (Lehrs p 109 denies this derivation, but Τείσιμος-Τεισίμαχος in Bechtel p 261) Σίσυφος-Σινόςσυφος (cf Σίνανδρος in Bechtel) Τήλεμος (read Τηλέλεμος)-Τληπόλεμος χαλῖφρων-χαλεσφῶν, etc

48 Μαῖρα καὶ Ὀρείθνια ἐνπλόκαμός τ' Ἀμάθνια, all meaningless names Possibly this verse was drawn from an ancient hymn, and ran Μαίρη

τ' Εἰλείθυιά τ' ἐνπλόκαμός (?) τ' Ἄλθεια, names which suggest relief at travail. The last name occurs in I555 as Ἀλθαίη, and obviously its root is that of ἄλθομαι

50 πᾶν δ' ἐν ἄρα γλαφυρὸν πλῆτο σπέος I ε-πλῆτο = ἐμπλητο Cf Φ607 πόλις δ' ἐμπλητο ραλέντων Υ156 τῶν δ' ἅπαν ἐπλήσθη (ἐμπλήσθη ?) πεδίον θ16 καρπαλίμως δ' ἐμπληντο βροτῶν (read ἐμπληντ' ἀνδρῶν) ἀγορῇ τε καὶ ἔδραι 495 ἀνδρῶν ἐμπλήσας For the distant tmesis cf 217 ἐπὶ δ' ὄρθια Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη φθέγγετο Ψ777 ἐν δ' ὄνθου βοέου πλῆτο στόμα Θ115 τῷ δ' εἰς ἀμφοτέρω Διομήδεος ἄρματ' ἐβήτην α8 οἱ κατὰ βοῦς Ὑπερίονος Ἀελίοιο ἥσθιον, and often Mss τῶν δὲ καὶ ἀργύφειον πλῆτο σπέος But (1) τῶν for τᾶων is not homeric (2) καὶ is meaningless (3) ἀργύφειον elsewhere is an attribute of raiment, the adjective reserved for σπέος is εὐρύ οἱ κοῖλοι, or γλαφυρὸν as I conjecture at this passage, or the reverse of ἀργύφειον, i e ἥρωειδὲς, cf ν103 ἄντρον ἐπήρατον (ἐπέρατον ?) ἥρωειδὲς, ἱρὸν νυμφάων αἰ Νηιάδες (read Ναϊάδες) καλέονται Hymn Herm 234 ἄντρον ἥρόεν It was a misreading of ἄρα γλαφυρὸν as ἀργύφειον that started this extensive corruption

ἄρα *Thyeiuron*, ἔπειτα Cf θ56 βάν ῥ' ἵμεν Ἀλκινόοιο δαΐφρονος ἐς μέγα δῶμα, πλῆντο δ' ἄρ' αἰθονσαι

52 κλύτε The first syllable is short, and there is no reason why we should write κλύτε

54 δυσαριστοτόκεια Felicitously rendered by Liddell and Scott by *unhappy mother of the noblest son*, for the preceding δ' ἐλὶ makes it plain that Thetis is lamenting her own sad fate The Scholiast's interpretation 'ἐπὶ κακῷ τὸν ἄριστον τεκοῦσα' is certainly mistaken

55 ἐπεὶ ἄρ τέκον It does not seem to me that ἄρ adds anything to the context, it was most probably inserted with the object of effecting a dactyl, the original reading being ἐπεὶ ἔτεκον

ύόν Mss υἱόν See note on ν 76

56 ὁ δ' ἀνέδραμεν ἔρνει ρίσος Cf ζ163 φοίνικος (read φοινικέον) νέον ἔρνος ἀνερχόμενον Herod 8-55 βλαστὸν ἐκ τοῦ στελέχεος ὅσον τε πηχυαῖον ἀναδεδραμηκότα FAESI-FRANKE Add ζ167 οὕτω τοῖον ἀνίλυθεν ἐκ δόρυ γαίης Theocr 18-29 λαὸν ἀνέδραμε κόσμος ἀρούρα ἡ κάπῳ κυπάριστος

τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ θρέψασα φυτὸν ὥς γονῶ ἀλωῆς,
 νηυσὶν ἐπὶ προέηκα κορωνίσιν *Φίλιον* εἶσω
 Τρωσὶ μαχεσόμενον, τὸν δ' οὐχ ὑποδέξομαι αὐτὶς
 φοίκαδε νοστήσαντα δόμον *Πηλείον* εἶσω 60
 Ὅφρα δέ μοι ζῶει καὶ ὄρᾳ φάος ἀελίοιο,
 ἄχυνται, οὐδέ τί μοι δύναμαι χραίσμῃσαι ἰοῦσα
 Ἄλλ' εἴμ' ὄφρα ρίδωμι φίλον τέκος, ἥδ' ἐπακούσω
 ὃ τι μιν ἴκετο πένθος ἀπὸ πολέμοιο μένοντα
 ὦ Ως ἄρα φωνήσασα λίπε σπέος, αἱ δὲ σὺν αὐτῇ 65
 δακρυβέσσαι ἴσαν, περὶ δέ σφισι κῦμα θαλάσσης
 ῥήγγυτο Ταὶ δ' ὅτε δὴ Τροίην ἐρίβωλον ἴκοντο,

57 θρέψασα φυτὸν ὥς γονῶ ἀλωῆς Imitated by Theocr 24-103 ἐπὶ
 ματρὶ νέον φυτὸν ὥς ἐν ἀλωῇ ἐτρέφετο

γονῶ Mss γουνῶ, repeated in v 438 But cf γονῇ γονὸς Γονόεσσα
 Scholia 'γονίμω τόπω'

ἀλωῆς An iota subscript re-appears in v 438 But E386 λ305
 Ἀλωῆος See note on v 28

58 νηυσὶν ἐπὶ προέηκα So a papyrus here and several documents
 at v 439, thus taking the preposition with νηυσὶν The variant
 ἐπιπροέηκα, so extensively adopted, is distinctly erroneous, for the
 preposition in such a connexion would denote direction, as in
 ο299 νήσοισιν ἐπιπροέηκα, but for this purpose we have εἶσω It is
 not improbable, however, that the original reading was νηυσὶν ἐνι ,
 cf B453 νέεσθαι ἐν νηυσὶ β18 Φίλιον εἰς ἐύπωλον ἔβη κούρησ' ἐν νηυσὶ

Φίλιον εἶσω And v 60 δόμον εἶσω Cf Φ125 εἶσω ἀλὸς κόλπον Ω199
 εἶσω στρατόν But also X425 Ἄιδος εἶσω θ290 εἶσω δώματος ἦε (ἔβη ?)
 as Ψ200 Ζεφύροιο ἐνδον See Lehrs p 142

59 μαχεσόμενον To this form lead the present tense μάχομαι,
 the infinitive μαχέσασθαι which is so often encountered, and the
 variants μαχέσσομαι μαχεσαμένω in A298 304 Aristarchos wrote,
 or found, μαχησόμενον, which is now the reading of our Mss, as
 from a present μαχέομαι, but this form, as pointed out by previous

critics, is fictitious. In the few places where it occurs, it calls for correction A272 ἐπιχθόνιοι μαχέοιτο seems to me to have been felicitously altered by vLesuwen into ἐπὶ χθονὶ ἄντα μάχοιτο, in A344 for μαχέονται or μαχέοντο read μαχέσονται, and so forth.

τὸν δ' οὐχ ὑποδέξομαι Perhaps νῦν δ' οὐ ῥ' ὑποδέξομαι See note on v 440

60 Πηλείον Mss Πηλῆιον See note on v 2.

61 ζῶει καὶ ὄρᾱ φάος This cannot be correct, for the contracted form ὄρᾱ is not homeric Probably ζῶος ὄραει φάος. For the absence of the participle ἐὼν cf Ω686 σέο δέ κε ζωῶ καὶ τρὶς τόσα δοῖεν ἄποινα

δαλίοιο Mss ἡλίοιο, the lengthening of its first syllable being rhythmical, see note on v 13 The word is found over 130 times, and its first syllable invariably forms the arsis, were it long, there is no reason why it should not occasionally form the thesis, for -έλιος -έλιον -ελίω -ελίου, if followed by a word beginning with a vowel, could constitute tribrachs

64 ὅ π. So Payne Knight Mss ὅττι As I remarked in my Notes on the X Book of the Iliad, its derivation from ὁδ-τι seems far-fetched That the duplication of the consonant was resorted to, as in so many other cases, with the idea of lengthening the preceding vowel is a perfectly adequate explanation.

πολέμοιο So one Ms, as in v 307 and often All our other Mss πολέμοιου, which is nothing but a clumsy metrical expedient like πόλις and τίπτε and of course ἀπτόλεμος Ἀρχεπτόλεμος ἐρυσίπολις μενεπτόλεμος πολυίεθρον πολυίπορθος Epenthetic letters, chiefly for the sake of producing dactyls, we find likewise in ἀπ[τ]ήνης (Ω275) ἐρί[γ]δονπος (cf Scholia at Λ45 'ἐπὶ δ' ἐγδούπησαν ὅτι διὰ τὸ μέτρον παράκειται τὸ γ, τὸν δὲ δούπον οὐκ ἂν εἴποι γδούπον') ἰθί[ν]τατα μόρ[σ]ι· μος νώνυμ[ι]ος ὅπ[ι]π[ι]τε ὅτ[τ]ι Ἀχιλ[λ]εὺς ἐμ[μ]εναὶ δυσάμ[μ]ορος, Ὀφελέ· [σ]της πτω[σ]κάζω, etc

66 περὶ δὲ σφισι κύμα θαλάσσης ῥήγνυτο And the wave of the sea broke round for them to pass, σφισι being a dativus commodi, as Ameis-Hentze comment.

67 Τροίην So Payne Knight Mss Τροίην

ἀκτὴν ἐξανέβαινον ἐπισχερῶ, ἔνθα θαμέες
 Μυρμιδόνων ἤγγονθ' ὕέες ταχὺν ἀμφ' Ἀχιλέα
 Τῷ δὲ βαρὺ στενάχοντι παρίστατο πόντια μήτηρ, 70
 ὁξὺ δὲ κωκύσασα κάρη λάβε παιδὸς ἑός,
 καὶ ρ' ὀλοφυρομένη ρέπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευε
 Τέκνον, τί κλαῖεις, τί δέ σε φρένας ἵκετο πένθος,
 Ἐξαύδα, μὴ κεῖθε Τὰ μὲν δὴ τοι τετέλεσται
 ἐκ Διὸς ὥς ἄρα δὴ πρὶν γ' εὖχεο χεῖρας ἀνασχών, 75
 πάντας ἐπὶ πρυμνήσι ραλέμεν ὕεας Ἀχαιῶν

68 ἐξανέβαινον Mss εἰσανέβαινον 'Ω97 Ar legebat ἐξαναβάσαι, hic igitur ἐξανέβαινον eum legisse veri simile est' vLxxwewen And it is obvious that ἐξανέβαινον depicts a more vivid picture, representing the Nereids not only as ascending the sea-shore but also as emerging from the sea. Cf δ405 ἀλὸς ἐξαναδύσαι μ306 ἐξαπέβησαν νεός ο206 νει δ' ἐνι πρυμνῇ εξαίνυτο δῶρα Thuc 7-23 ἐς τὸ στρατόπεδον ἐξεκομίζοντο, etc

ἐπισχερῶ A doubtful adverb Scholia 'ὁξύνεται καὶ σεσημείωται ὥσπερ καὶ τὸ ἰὼ, οὐδὲν γὰρ εἰς ω λήγον ἐπίρρημα θέλει ὁξύνεσθαι'

θαμέες Μυρμιδόνων ἤγγονθ' ὕέες ταχὺν ἀμφ' Ἀχιλέα Mss θαμειαὶ Μυρμιδόνων εἶρυντο νέες ταχὺν ἀμφ' Ἀχιλῆα. It seems a strange idea to say that the ships had been hauled up round Achilles, nor does this particular add anything important to the image for it to be specially mentioned On the other hand, cf Ψ233 οἱ δ' ἀμφ' Ἀτρείωνα (Bentley Ἀτρείωνας, read Ἀτρείοντας) ἀρῶλλέες ἠγερέθοντο For Μυρμιδόνων ὕέες cf 76 ὕεας Ἀχαιῶν, and often Probably a wish to discard the iamb in θαμέες was the impulse towards the corruption

71 παιδὸς ἑός Cf 138 and A393 In all three passages the Mss fluctuate between ἐῆος and ἐῆος, but Eustathios is right in saying 'ἡ μάλλον ἐῆος', for, this genitive being that of ἐῆς, the aspirate is out of court and has probably been induced by the alternative reading ἐοῶ The declension in -ῆος is only a metrical

convenience, for which refer to my note on v. 2 Prompted by a similar convenience *έων* (= *ἀγαθῶν*, *good things*) in θ325 335 and Ω528 became *ιάων* LMeyer has perceived that this was incorrect, but in an endeavour to avoid the iamb he proposed to alter it into *έέρων* or *έήρων* The variant *έοιο* does not lack support, cf E371 *μητρὸς έρῆς*

72 *καί ρ' ὀλοφυρομένη* So Brandreth Mss *καί ρ' ὀλοφυρομένη*, where the combination *καί ρα* is exceedingly objectionable

ῥέπεα πτερόεντ' ἄγορεύε Mss *ῥεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα*, where *προσηύδα* doubly offends, namely, by its contraction and by *πρ-* not prolonging the antecedent vowel The phrase adopted exists as a variant for *ῥεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα* in Δ203 Φ121 427 Ψ535 625 δ189 ι409 ρ349, and for *ῥεα Τρώεσσι προσηύδα* in Θ496

74. *έξαύδα, μή κεύθε*. So also in A363 II19 But the contraction not being homeric, I suggest *αὔδαε* (cf v 426 Ξ195 ε89 *αὔδα' ὃ τι φρονέεις*), *μή μοι κεύθε*, the pronoun being a dativus commodi as in vv 4 and 6b, where see notes

76 *πάντας ἐπὶ πρυμνήσι ραλέμεν ὕεας* Judging by such combinations in our present texts as O722 *μάχεσθαι ἐπὶ πρυμνήσι νέεσι* and μ411 *πρυμνή ἐπὶ νέι*, I should infer that *πρυμνή* was at first a *κοσμητικὸν ἐπίθετον* of *νηὺς*, which eventually in some way evolved into a substantive synonymous with *νηὺς*, as is clear from A409 *κατὰ πρυμνάς τε καὶ ἀμφ' ἄλα ῥέλσαι Ἀχαιοὺς* and Ξ32 *τείχος ἐπὶ πρυμνήσιν ἔδειμαν* If so, we must accentuate *πρυμνήσιν*, the accent upon the first syllable being reserved for such cases where the stern is designated, as in O716 *πρύμνηθεν ἐπεὶ λάβεν* and ν84 *πρύμνη* (Rochefort *πῶρη*) *μὲν αἰέρετο*

ραλέμεν Mss *ἀλήμεναι* See note on v 14.

ὕεας Mss *νίας* Respecting the first syllable *νι-* I have noted at X8 that it is frequently found short, whereas a diphthong before a vowel cannot be shortened except at the end of a word See also my notes on vv 200 436 458. Jannaris in his *Hist Gr Gram* § 29 states 'When in the seventh and sixth centuries a spirit of national education awoke and the ancestral literature, then all in verse, was

σέ' ἐπιδεομένους, παθέμεν δ' ἀρικήλια ρέργα

Τὴν δὲ βαρὺ στενάχων προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλεὺς·

Μήτηρ ἐμῇ, τὰ μὲν ἄρ μοι Ὀλύμπιος ἐξετέλεσεν,

ἀλλὰ τί μοι τῶν ῥῆδος ἐπεὶ φίλος ὦλεθ' ἐταῖρος, 80

Πάτροκλος, τὸν ἐγὼ περὶ πάντων τίον ἐταίρων,

ῤῖσον ἐμῇ κεφαλῇ, Τὸν ἀπώλεσα, τεύχεα δ' Ἐκτωρ

δαΐζας ῤ' ἀπέδυσε πελώρια, θαῦμα ϊδέσθαι,

adopted as the basis of the educational system, schoolmasters found that the current texts exhibited certain metrical anomalies which had to be removed in the interest of their pupils. Accordingly teachers and commentators began to mark the affected syllables with conventional signs. In Achaëic and Aeolic countries the marks resorted to were either a doubling of the succeeding consonant or an epenthetic *iota*. Such an epenthetic *iota* we find in ἀγροῖωται Μενoitίος μυχοίτατος Πυλοισιγνήs προπαρόισθε Φιλοίτιος ἐμέιο κλείω τελείω νεικείω γνῖα ἀραρυῖαν, etc.

Respecting the Mss *vias*, *ι e ias*, it would have *is* as its nominative, thus the word for *son* would be the same as that for *pig* (*is*), and I cannot imagine that any language in the world could be quite so grotesque.

77 σί(ο) This and ἐμέο in many places are demanded by the rhythm. Mss *σεῦ* unhomerically. Against Platt's reading σεί(ο) see preceding note.

ἐπιδεομένους See note on v 24. Most Mss ἐπιδευομένους, but δεύομαι means to be drenched. And further the original word was probably ἐνιδεομένους, as also ἐπιδεῖς was ἐνιδεῖς, to which leads the Attic ἐνδεῖς. In A134 for ἦσθαι δυνόμενον read ἦσθ' ἐνδεόμενον.

παθέμεν So LMeyer. Mss παθέειν, an impossible form.

ἀρικήλια Fick ἀρικήλλια. Mss fancifully ἀεκήλια. Heyne 'sensus est idem qui τοῦ ἀεικῆs ἀεικέλιος,' accordingly Brandreth suggested ἀρικήλια, *indigna*. But frequently we find ἔκελος with its initial syllable in the thesis, therefore short. The pseudo-metrical *η* appears

likewise in ἀμφιγυῖεις Ἄρῃος ἀφήτορος Ἀχιλῆος ἐλαφιβόλος ἐπήβολος (ἐπίορος?) ἐπηγετανός (read ἐπίφρετανός) κοτῆεις μάντης πέδηλα (K132) πολέμια πόλῃος πολίτης τελεῖσσας τοκήων (see note on v. 2), and perhaps in other words. See also note on v 154

78 Ἀχιλεὺς This is the proper form and not the variant Ἀχιλλεύς. It is the only form which the rhythm will allow at vv 2 28 30 33 69 152 354 358 A74 322 558, etc. On the other hand, where the reading varies between the two forms (as at vv 203 228 234 247 343 A7 58 84 121 etc), the one with a single λ is admissible so long as we are convinced as to the legitimacy of iambs. I cannot myself believe that Homer's contemporaries at one time pronounced Ἀχιλλεύς and at another Ἀχιλλεύς. To us, who judge by the eye, this Ἀχιλλεύς may appear tolerable, but to the homeric ear it must have sounded foreign. See also my note on v 36

79 ἄρ μοι Ὀλύμπιος Qu. ἄρα μοι(οι) Ὀλύμπιος

ἔξετλεσεν So a papyrus, but the amanuensis added an interlinear σ so as to conform to the fictitious form ἔξετλέσσειν to which he was accustomed. The double σ now disguises almost all our documents

80 ῥῆδος In A576 A318 σ104, where the rhythm does not admit of the digamma, we should probably substitute ὄφελος. The defect reappears in ω95, but that part is of course a post-homeric production

81 τῖον This is the preponderatingly attested accentuation and the only correct one, cf Δ257 Ἰδομενεῦ, περὶ μὲν σε τῖω, etc. By not realizing the extent to which tribrachs are homeric all editors adopt the solecistic variant τῖον. Similar misconceptions in vv 140 371 423 Z399 (λῖεν in one Ms) Ω1

83 δαΐφας ϐ(ε). *Having slain him* Cf T211 δεδαιγμένος ὃξεί χαλῶ, etc. Mss δῆσας, a fanciful form for δαιώσας, see note on v 13

πελώρια This should be πελόρια, for πέλωρ-πέλορος like ἀλάστωρ ἀλάστορος κτήτωρ-κτήτορος Νέστωρ-Νέστορος ῥήτωρ-ῥήτορος, etc. Moreover, nowhere else are Achilles's arms commended for their size, were size their chief distinction, those made by Hephaistos would

καλά τὰ μὲν Πηλείε θεοὶ δόσαν ἀγλαὰ δῶρα
 ἡματι τῷ ὅτε σε βροτοῦ ἀνέρος ἔμβαλον εὐνῇ. 85
 ὧς ὄφελος σὺ μὲν αὖθι μετ' ἀθανάτησ' ἀλήησι
 ναίειν, Πηλεὺς δὲ θνητὴν ἀγαγέσθαι ἀκοιτῖν
 Νῦν δ' ἵνα καὶ σοὶ πένθος ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μυρίον ἔη
 παιδὸς ἀποφθιμένοιο, τὸν οὐχ ὑποδέξεται αὖτις
 ροίκαδ' εὖ νοστήσαντ', ἐπεὶ οὐδ' ἐμὲ θυμὸς ἀνώγει 90
 ζῶειν οὐδ' ἀνδράσι μετέμεναι, αἶ κε μῆ" Ἐκτωρ
 πρῶτον ἐμῷ ὑπὸ δουρὶ τυπείς ἀπὸ θυμὸν ὀλέσῃ,
 Πατρόκλου δὲ ρέλορα Μενοτιάδ' ἀποτίσῃ
 Τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέερεπε Θέτις κατὰ δάκρυ χέουσα
 Ὀκύμορος δὴ μοι, τέκος, ἔσσαι οἷ' ἀγορεύεις 95
 αὐτίκα γάρ τοι ἔπειτα μεθ' Ἐκτορα πότμος ἐτοῖμος
 Τὴν δὲ μέγ' ὀχθήσας προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλεὺς
 Αὐτίκα τεθναίην, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἄρ' ἐμελλον ἑταίρω

have been particularly represented as enormous I suggest *παναίολα*, for arms at E295 are called αἰόλα and at Δ432 etc ποικίλα Compare *παμποίκιλος*

86 ὧς ὄφελος For ὧς in optandi formulis refer to Ebeling v ὧς, section A, IV, where he adduces Σ107 ὧς ἔρις ἔλ τε θεῶν ἔκ τ' ἀνθρώπων ἀπόλοιτο and X286 ὧς δὴ μιν σῶ ἐν χρόι πᾶν κομίσαιο Similarly οὕτω, cf Menand Epitr 47 οὕτω τί σοι ἀγαθὸν γένοιτο, where Waddell refers to Arist Thes 46⁹ οὕτως ὄναιμην and Herodas 3-1 οὕτω τί σοι δοίησαν. Also ὦδε, see note on v 272 Instead of ὧς, which is backed by the authority of a papyrus, Mss exhibit also the variant αἶθε, this may originally have been a marginal note indicating that of the various significations of ὧς that of αἶθε was the best suited to the context

88 νῦν δ(ε) Had Achilles completed his thought, he would have expressed it in some such way as νῦν δὲ σὸς παῖς, θνητοῦ πατρὸς θνητὸς γεγώς, ἀποφθίσεται καὶ μιν οὐχ ὑποδέξεται.

ξη The subjunctive is favoured both by the papyrus lection *εηη* and the context, which demands the future (subjunctive) The optative, which is universally adopted except by Bothe—who, however, fancifully writes *ῆη*—we owe to the persistent substitutions of iambs by spondees, a partiality which is still in the order of the day

91 ἀνδράσι So often Mss ἀνδρεσσι or (Ub) ἀνδρεσι See note on v. 328

μετέμεναι. Mss μετέμμεναι See note on v 14.

92 πρῶτον So vHerwerden Mss πρῶτος

93. Πατρόκλου δὲ βέλωρα So Heyne, except that he retained the long penultimate of βέλωρα Mss Πατρόκλοις δ' ἔλωρα For the short penultimate see note on v 83 Brandieth remarks 'forma βέλωρα non aliqui occurrit,' but this plural as βέλωρα is adequately defended by the singular βέλωρ and recurs in A4 αἰτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια τεύχε κύνεσσιν, where I believe the proper lection is αἰτοὺς δὲ βέλωρα κύνεσσιν (the single σ in two Mss) ἐτείχε

Μενoitιάδε(ο) See note on v 455 Mss Μενoitιάδεω or Μενoitιάδα(ο) The Doric genitive, which is so frequently met with and generally adopted, is quite unnecessary and only disfigures the text The contracted Attic form Μενoitιάδων demonstrates that the old Ionic genitive was in -εο In Ψ76 for νεύομαι ἐξ Ἀΐδαο ἐπὶ substitute νέομαι ἐξ Ἀΐδόθεν ἐπεί

94 προσέφηπε Mss προσέειπε It ought to be clear that ἔειπον has been intruded from the Attic εἶπον, which form is accountable for by the fact that after the loss of the digamma the resultant ἔειπον was contracted If not, then by what process could the vowel in the homeric root, *φειπ* (cf. *φείπος*) be lengthened? In most passages the archaic form can be restored, but it is not surprising that, some verses having been extensively tampered with in order to obliterate the tribrach in *ἔφειπον*, it should now be most difficult, perhaps occasionally even impossible, to re-instate it without very violent handling. See also note on v. 297

95 ἔσσαι So one Ms, the rest ἔσσειαι See note on v 36

κτεινομένῳ ἐπαρηξέμεν, ὃ δ' ἄρα τηλόθι πάτρης ἔφθιτ', ἐμὲ δ' ἐρλίσσειτ' ἀρῆς ῥ' ἀλκτῆρα γενέσθαι.	100
Νῦν δ', ἐπεὶ οὐ νέομαι γε φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν, οὐδέ τι Πατρόκλῳ γενόμεν φάος οὐδ' ἐπάρηξα, τοῖς ἄλλοις, οἳ δὴ πολέες δάμεν Ἑκτορι δίῳ, ἀλλ' ἦμαι παρὰ νηυσὶν ἐτώσιον ἄχθος ἀρούρης,	105
τοῖος ἐὼν οἷος οὐ τις Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων ἐν πολέμῳ ἀγορῇ δέ τ' ἀμείνονές εἰσι καὶ ἄλλοι ὥς ἔρις ἔκ τε θεῶν ἔκ τ' ἀνθρώπων ἀπόλοιτο, καὶ χόλος ὥς τ' ἐφέηκε πολὺφρονά περ χαλεπῆναι, ὥς τε πολὺ γλυκίων μέλιτος καταλειβομένοιο ἀνδρῶν ἐν στήθεσσιν ἀέξεται ἥυτε καπνός	110
ὥς ἐμὲ νῦν ἐχόλωσε ῥάναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων	

99 κτεινομένῳ ἐπαρηξέμεν, ὃ δ' ἄρα τηλόθι Cf Ξ265 Τρώεσσιν ἀρηξέμεν (probably Τρωσὶν ἐπαρηξέμεν) Ψ783 Ὀδυσσεὶ παρίσταται ἥδ' ἐπαρηγῇ Ω39 Ἀχιλεὶ βούλεισθ' ἐπαρήγειν Mss κτεινομένῳ ἐπαμῦναι, ὃ μὲν μάλα τηλόθι But, as was remarked by previous expositors, ἐμελλον governs a future tense and not an aorist, besides, μὲν is not suited to the context From Ν9 Τρώεσσιν ἀρηξέμεν, where there is a variant ἀμυνέμει, I conclude that ἐπαμῦναι was a γλώσσημα

ἄρα As a consequence

100 ἐμὲ δ' ἐρλίσσειτ' ἀρῆς ῥ' ἀλκτῆρα Mss ἐμείο (or ἐμοῖο) δ' ἔδθησεν ἀρῆς (or Ἄρεω) ἀλκτῆρα which with good reason Eustathios pronounces a 'στροβιλὸν νόημα καὶ δυσφραδές' The correction ἐρλίσσετο may appear too bold—and I daresay many will turn away from the ensuing iamb—but Homer never employs δέομαι or δέω (the latter, as Brandreth remarks, can only mean *ligo*) in the sense of *entreating*, but invariably ρλίσσομαι or αἰρέω The disturbance probably arose from ignorance that ρλίσσομαι begins with a double consonant which prolongs an antecedent vowel

ἀρῆς Scholia 'βλάβης, ὡς τὸ [χ208] Μέντορ, ἀμνον ἀρῆν'

ῥ(οι) Palpably required by the context

ἀλκτῆρα Shortened from ἀλεξητῆρα, as Aristarchos paraphrases, see note on v 47

102. οὐδ' ἐπάρηξα. See my note on v 99 *Μας οὐδ' ἐτάρουσι*. But in the whole course of Achilles's long lamentation from vv 79 to 93 his other companions are ignored, his mind being totally engrossed by his loss of Patroklos. Moreover, I thoroughly mistrust ἔταρος as a genuine word, it abounds in later literature, but that literature borrowed it from the homeric texts after their debasement. In the *Odyssey*, where it is frequently found, the context in many places admits with advantage ἐρέτας for ἐτάρους.

103 τοῖς ἄλλοις. Perfectly frigid. The verse is spurious.

105 to 113. Spurious. Regarding vv 105 and 106 Payne Knight remarks 'Redolere male sedulam rhapsodi operam in delatanda enuntiatione, recte monuit Heyne, et, quod vir doctissimus non observavit, οἷος priore brevi interpolatorem planè prodit.' Naber has extended the athetesis down to v 113. The intervention of these verses thoroughly damps instead of enforcing the explosion of passion, is it credible that Homer, in depicting Achilles's overmastering grief, made him indulge in philosophical generalities? The reflection ἀγορῇ δέ τ' ἀμείνονές εἰσι καὶ ἄλλοι at such a moment is particularly insipid.

105 οἷος. Encountered in about 180 places, and everywhere its first syllable is long, except in the spurious verses η312 and υ89, where the same phrase τοῖος ἐὼν οἷος is repeated.

106 δέ τ(ε). This combination recurs in vv 201 321 485 and often. It is against common sense, as is also καὶ τε in v 488. In E118 δὺς δέ τέ μ' ἄνδρα ἐλείν καὶ ἐς ὄρμην ἔγχεος ἐλθεῖν read δὺς δέ μοι ἄνδρ ἐλέμεν καὶ ἐς ὄρμην μ(οι) ἔγχεος ἐλθεῖν.

108 ἐφέηκε. It should have been either ἀνέηκε as in Z256 θυμὸς ἀνῆκε χεῖρας ἀνασχεῖν, or ἐνέηκε as in I700 νῦν αὖ μιν πολὺ μᾶλλον ἀγνηορήσιν ἐνῆκας, etc. And so also at v 124.

109 μέλιτος καταλειβομένοιο. What the interpolator wished, but did not manage, to say was ἐσθρομένοιο, and his addition of ἥτε καπνὸς creates an odd example of mixed metaphors. The verb is besides a ἀπαξ εἰρημένον in Homer.

- Ἄλλα τὰ μὲν προτετύχθαι ἑάσομεν ἀγνώμενοί περ,
 θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλον δαμάσαντες ἀνάγκη
 νῦν εἴμ' ὄφρα φίλης κεφαλῆς ὀλετῆρα κιχέω,
 "Εκτορα, κῆρα δ' ἐγὼ τότε δέξομαι, ὅποτε κεν δῇ 115
 Ζεὺς ἐθέλῃ τελέσαι ἡδ' ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι
 Οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ βίη Ἡρακλῆος φύγε κῆρα,
 ὅς περ φίλτατος ἔσκε Διὶ Κρονίῳνι βῆνακτι,
 ἀλλὰ ρε μοῖρ' ἐδάμασσε καὶ ἀργαλέος χόλος Ἥρης 120
 "Ὡς καὶ ἐγὼν, εἰ δὴ μοι ὁμοίη μοῖρα τέτυκται,
 κείσομ' ἐπεὶ κε θάνω νῦν δὲ κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἀροίμην,
 καὶ τινα Τρωϊάδων καὶ Δαρδανίδων βαθυκόλπων,
 ἀμφοτέρησιν χερσὶ παρειῶν ἀπαλάων
 δάκρυ' ὁμωρξάμενῃν, ἀδινὸν στοναχῆσαι ἐφείην,
 γνοίην δ' ὥς δὴ δηρὸν ἐγὼ πολέμοιο πεπαύμην 125
 Μηδὲ μ' ἔρυκε μάχης φιλιουσά περ, οὐδέ με πείσεις
 Τὸν δ' ἡμείβετ' ἔπειτα θεὰ Θέτις ἀργυρόπεζα
 Ναὶ δὴ ταῦτά γε, τέκνον, ἐτήτυμον οὐ κακὸν ἐστί
 τειρομένοις ἐτάροισιν ἀμνέμεν αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον
 Ἀλλὰ τοι ἔντεα καλὰ μετὰ Τρώεσσιν ἔχονται, 130
 χάλκεα μαρμαίροντα. Τὰ μὲν κορυθαίολος Ἔκτωρ
 αὐτὸς ἔχων ὁμοιοῖσι ἀγάλλεται οὐδέ ρέ φημι
 δηρὸν επαγλαιεῖσθαι, ἐπεὶ φόνος ἐγγίθην αὐτῷ

112 and 113 Verses taken from T65 and 66, here they are out of place

114 νῦν εἴμι Mss νῦν δ' εἴμι There is no trace of an antithesis, such as would call for the addition of the particle, νῦν here merely reiterates that of v 101, 'εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τῆς ἀρχῆς' as the Scholiast comments at that verse. A like unnecessary δὲ figures in most witnesses at Y271

κιχέω Mss κιχείω See notes on vv 387 and 409

115 Ἔκτορα For its derivation see note on v 47

ὅποτε A form found in numerous verses. The Mss ὀπόποτε is pseudo-metrical

116 Here ends Achilles's outburst with the utterance of a firm

determination to face death if thus he could avenge that of his cherished companion. The subsequent verses down to v 126, with their argumentation, braggadocio, and longing for glory, are as incongruous and unpoetical as vv 105 to 113, they are probably the handiwork of the same amplifier. The Attic non-lengthening of the syllable before *Τρωάδων* betrays clearly enough the recent character of the versification. Vv 117 to 121 condemned by Jacob, vv 117 to 119 by La Roche, v 125 by Kammei.

120 *ὁμοίη μοῖρα* Perhaps *ἐτοίμη μοῖρα* as an answer to v 96 *αὐτίκα γάρ τοι ἔπειτα πότμος ἐτοῖμος*

123 Instead of *παριείδων* a papyrus had a word, of which the end *ῶν* is preserved, I do not know that it has so far been discovered what that word was

124 *ἔφειν* Rather *ἐνείην* or *ἀνείην*, see note on v 108

125 *δηρὸν ἐγὼ πολέμοιο πεπαύμην* Suggested by v 248 *δηρὸν δὲ μάχης ἐπέπαντο*, I have therefore preferred the reading *πεπαύμην*, which is that of most Mss, to *πέπανμαι*, which is that commonly adopted. The absence of augment probably occasioned the change.

128 and 129 Spurious Ameis-Hentze 'Achills ausgesprochene Absicht war freilich nicht sowohl den bedrängten Seinen beizustehen als den Patroklos zu rächen'. See also note on v 102. It may be further urged that there was nothing in what Achilles said to elicit a reply from Thetis that it was true. It is most probable, however, that in the place of v 128 there was some such verse as *ναὶ δὴ ταῦτά γε πάντα, τέκος, κατὰ μοῖραν ἔρπεες* as in Ψ626, and that then v 134 followed. For I believe that vv 130 to 133 are equally spurious—Kammei has already condemned 131 to 133—for they certainly read as if, contrary to v 83, Thetis was the first to give the information as to her son's arms being now in Hector's hands.

132 *ὤμοισιν* One Ms *ὤμοι*, which, were the verse genuine, I should prefer.

133 *ἐπαγλαῖεσθαι* From the foregoing *ἀγάλλεται* I should conclude that the original reading was *ἐπαγαλέεσθαι* as the future of *ἀγαλλομαι* must be, cf *ἀγαλοῖμεν* in Arist Pax, 399.

Ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν μή πω καταδύσσο μῶλον Ἄρεος
 πρίν γ' ἐμὲ δεῦρ' ἔλθοῦσαν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσι ρίδῃαι, 135
 ἥδοθεν γὰρ νέομ' ἄμ' ἀελίφ' ἀνιόντι
 τεύχεα καλὰ φέρουσα παρ' Ἡφαίστοιο ράνακτος
 ὦς ἄρα φωνήσασα πάλιν τράπεθ' ὑοῦ ἑέος,
 καὶ στρεφθεῖς ἀλίῃσι κασιγνήτησ' ἀγόρευε
 Ἵμεις μὲν νῦν δῦτε θαλάσσης εὐρέα κόλπον 140
 ὀψόμεναί τε γέρονθ' ἄλιον καὶ δώματα πατρὸς,
 καὶ ροὶ πάντ' ἀγορεύσατ' ἐγὼ δ' ἐς μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον
 εἶμι παρ' Ἡφαιστον κλυτοτέχνην, αἳ κ' ἐθέλῃσιν
 ὑέ' ἐμῷ δόμεναι κλυτὰ τεύχεα παμφανόεντα

134 Ἄρεος So Payne Knight (*αρεος*) The true form appears in B479 Δ441 T47 and θ267, in all other verses, to the number of about 85, our texts exhibit the form -ης. It must strike one as strange that, whereas all other adjectives and nouns in -ης of the third declension, numbering over 100, including several proper names (Διομήδης Ἰθαιμένης Εὐμήδης Κλυτομήδης Λυκομήδης Πολυνείκης Πολυρείδης) form their declension in -εος, Ἄρης alone should deviate into -ης. This deviation, however, is only apparent, for, provided that we admit tribrachs and iambs as legitimate substitutes for dactyls and spondees, we can with a few exceptions restore the form εος without damaging the rhythm or otherwise disturbing the wording. The exceptions are as follows:

(1) B515 Ἄρηι. In the Catalogue, therefore in a recent production

(2) B767 Ἄρηος. Also in the Catalogue

(3) Y152 Ἄρηα. In a spurious verse, as is clear from the fact of η- occurring in the thesis

(4) Φ112 ὅππότε τις καὶ ἐμῷ Ἄρη (οἱ Ἄρει) ἐκ θυμὸν ἔλγεται, where the awkwardness of the phrase and the inappropriateness of the sentiment expressed in vv 111 to 113 betray the hand of an unskilful interpolator

(5) Γ128 ἔπ' Ἄρης παλαμίων, read Ἄρεος ὑπὸ παλαμίων

(6) E757 Ἄρῃ τάδε καρτερὰ ἔργα, read Ἄρε' ἐρὰ καρτερὰ ῥέργα

(7) E827 μήτε σύ γ' Ἄρῃα τόδε δέδριθι, read μήτε τι σύ γ' Ἄρε' ὠδέ γε δεδριθι.

(8) E829 ἀλλ' ἄγ' ἐπ' Ἄρῃι πρώτῳ ἔχε, probably ἄγ' Ἄρει ἐπι (for the hiatus see Monro's Homeric Grammar §376) προτέρῳ ἔχε

(9) E841 αὐτίκ' ἐπ' Ἄρῃι πρώτῳ, an asyndeton, read αὐτίκα δ' Ἄρε' ἐπι προτέρῳ

(10) θ276 κεχολωμένος Ἄρει, a contracted form, read ἦτορ and compare Ξ367 κεχολωμένος ἦτορ and Η585 κεχόλωσο δὲ κῆρ

In the following words likewise -ῃ- is replaceable by -ε- Ἀρηί-θοος ἀρηιθῶων ἀρηίος Ἀρηίλυκος ἀρηίφατος ἀρηίφιλος, it is not replaceable in Χ72 ἀρηικταμένῳ, but Heyne has pointed out that the whole passage of vv 69 to 76 is spurious

136 ἥσοθεν So Brandreth Mss ἥσθεν I further suspect that the proper reading is really ἰσόθεν, for I doubt the genuineness of the form ἥως instead of ἕως οἱ ἕως, the disfigurement is probably due to a metrical convenience See notes on vv 61 and 77

νέομαι Mss νεῦμαι with a non-epic contraction, it was introduced to effect a dactyl

ἀελίῳ Mss ἥελίῳ See note on v 61

138 οὐὸ ἰέος Mss νιοῦ ἰῆος or ἰοῖο See notes on vv 71 and 76

139 κασιγνήτησ' ἀγόρευε Mss κασιγνήτησι μετηύδα See on v 72

140 ὕμες So vLeeuwen Mss ὑμεῖς

δύτε Usually written δῦτε, but the root is short and I do not see what could have lengthened it in δῦτε Similarly I would write λῦτο in Ω1 This error is due to the fact that tribrachs, in which -δυ- and -λυ- form the arses, have been assumed to be dactyls I should also prefer βῆ (ἔβη) γνῶ (ἔγνω) δὺ (ἔδυν) στὰν (ἔστην) στῆν (ἔστην) φῆν (ἔφην) φθῆ (ἔφθη)

141 δέ ἐμῷ Rzach νιέ ἐμῷ Mss νιέῖ ἐμῷ See note on v 76

παμφανέντα Mss παμφανόνοντα Cf Ψ509, where the reading fluctuates between παμφανόνοντος and παμφανόνετος, and Σ206, where for παμφανόνονσαν there is a variant παμφανόνεσαν As I have pointed out at X26, the participles παμφαινων and παμφανόνων exhibit this

ὧς ἔφαθ', αἱ δ' ὑπὸ κῦμα θαλάσσης αὐτίκ' ἔδυσαν, 145
 ἢ δ' αὖτ' Ὀλυμπόνδε θεὰ Θέτις ἀργυρόπεζα
 ἦεν ὄφρα φίλῳ παιδί κλυτὰ τεύχε' ἐνείκαι
 Τὴν μὲν ἄρ' Ὀλυμπόνδε πόδες φέρον Ἀτὰρ Ἀχαιοὶ
 θεσπεσίῳ ἀλαλητῷ ὕφ' Ἑκτορος ἀνδροφόνιοι
 φεύγοντες νῆας τε καὶ Ἑλλήσποντον ἴκοντο 150
 Οὐδ' ἄρα Πάτροκλόν κεν ἑυκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοὶ
 ἐκ βελέων βερύσαντο, νέκυν θεράποντ' Ἀχιλῆος,
 αὖτις γὰρ δὴ τὸν γε κίχεν λαὸς τε καὶ ἵπποι,
 Ἔκτωρ τε Πριάμιος υἱός, φλογὶ ρίκελος ἄντην.

peculiarity, that, whereas they occur some twenty-five times, the other moods are only represented by παμφαίῃσι in E6 and páμφαιον in A30. Even in these two passages the verbs are corrupt, in the former the subjunctive is ungrammatical (see vLeeuwen) and in the latter the sense requires a verb like ἐπέπηγεν. Why this lack of the other moods? Everywhere the participles can, and it seems to me should, be superseded by the adjective παμφανούς. The following participles share the same peculiarity: γανῶν κερηκομόων κομόων κυμαίνων λαμπεῶν τηλεθῶν ὑπερηγορέων ὑπερμενέων ὑπερηφανέων, for which I would substitute γανόεις κερηκομόεις κομόεις κυματούεις λαμπετούεις τηλεθούεις ὑπερηγορούεις ὑπερμενούεις ὑπερηφανούεις. The error of form is made manifest in ζ87 and ω227, where instead of ῥυπύοντα two Mss give ῥυπύοντα, in γ290, where Mss give both τροφύοντα and τροφέοντα, in δ227, where for μητιύοντα a variant μητιώοντα is suggested, in A157, where we are told Aristarchos substituted σκυύοντα for σκυοίοντα (probably the reverse is really the case), and in K206, where the reading varies between ἐσχατόωντα and ἐσχατούοντα. Similarly Hesiod Her 231 for ἐπικυρτώνοντε there is a variant ἐπὶ κυρτώνοντα, i.e. ἐπικυρτόετε, Theog 699 αἰγὴ μαρμαίρουσα, but Soph Ant 610 μαρμαρούσαν αἶγλαν and Arist Nub 286 μαρμαραίσιν (most probably μαρμαρούσαι) αἰγαῖς. I may here add that B415 αἰθαλύν is an error for θαλαμύν (similarly χ239), and in Ω191 θάλαμον κῆνέοντα is probably a corruption of θάλαμον κενθμονέοντα.

148 ἀτάρ So found in numerous places The alternative αὐτάρ is but a fabrication for rhythmical convenience after αὐτε Both αὐτάρ and ἀτάρ cannot be right, see note on v 36 In this rhapsody αὐτάρ recurs in vv 203 314 349 446 451 475 481 609 614

150 νῆας An erroneous form, see note on v 260 Perhaps κλισίας, here as well as in the parallel verses O233 and Ψ2, and κλισίων for νηῶν in Ξ28 Verse P432, where we find a similar sentence, is spurious

151. οὐδ' ἄρα (so a variant adopted by Nauck) Πάτροκλόν κεν Mss οὐδέ κε Πάτροκλόν περ, but περ has no force

152. Ρερίσαντο, νέκυν θεράποντ' Ἀχιλλέος Vere Aristarchos ad P240 Ω108 observavit νέκυν substantivum esse (*corpus*) genitivum adsciscens, νεκρὸν vero adjectivum (*mortuum*), coll μ10 νΛΕΕΥΩΝ To get over the difficulty editors detach νέκυν from θεράποντα by a comma, this is too artificial Perhaps ἐν θεράποντα, cf Π464 653 Ψ888 Similarly P388 ἀγαθὸν θεράποντα ποδώκεος Αἰακίδεο The hiatus between Ρερίσαντο and ἐν is not unusual, cf I127 ἡνείκαντο δέθλια, etc For the Mss Ἀχιλῆος see note on v 2

153 κίχεν So LMeyer Mss κίχον

λαός Probably ληός as νηός So Hipponax 88

154 Πριάμιος ὕος Cf Δ563 Τελαμώνιον ὕον Κ18 Νηλείον ὕον (Mss ἀνδρῶν), etc Mss Πριάμοιο παῖς, representing an attempt at eliminating the tribrach But παῖς concurrently with παῖς cannot stand, see notes on vv 36 and 569

φλογὶ ρίκελος ἄντην Cf β5 δ310 ἐναλίγκιος ἄντην A187 γ120 ὁμοιωθήμεναι ἄντην Ω630 θεοῖσι γὰρ ἄντ' ἐρεβοίκει The Mss ἀλκῆν instead of ἄντην ill accords with φλογὶ and no doubt owes its presence to the proximate ἀλκῆν in v 157. Zenodotos laboured to patch up the incongruity by substituting σνὶ for φλογὶ But P88 (Ἐκτωρ) φλογὶ ρίκελος

ρίκελος Most Mss εἶκελος, a few ἴκελος The word frequently occurs in the thesis with its initial syllable short The iota was turned into ει after εἰκὸς for the sake of introducing a long vowel into the arsis

Τρὶς μὲν μιν μετόπισθε ποδῶν λάβει φαίδιμος Ἴκτωρ ἐλκόμεναι μεμαῶς, μέγα δὲ Τρῳέσιν ἄνε, τρὶς δὲ δὺ Αἴαντες, θοῦριν ἐπιρριμένοι ἀλκὴν, νεκροῦ ἀπεστυφίλιζαν Ὅ δ' ἔμπεδον, ἀλκὴ πεποιθῶς, ἄλλοτ' ἐπαίξασκε κατὰ μόθον, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε στάσκει μέγα ριάχων, ὀπίσω δ' οὐ χάζετο πάμπαν	155 160
Ὦς δ' ἀπὸ σώματος οὐ τιλέοντ' αἰθωνα δύνανται ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι μέγα πεινάοντα δέσθαι, ὥς ῥα τὸν οὐκ ἐδύναντο δῶν Αἴαντε κορυστὰ Ἴκτορα Πριαμίδην ἀπὸ νεκροῦ δειδίξασθαι Καὶ νῦν κέ ρ' ἐκφέρυσέν τε καὶ ἀσπετον ἤρετο κῦδος, εἰ μὴ Πηλεῖονι ποδῆνεμος ὤκει' Ἴρις	 165

156 μέγα δὲ Τρῳέσιν (so a variant) ἄνε Cf. Ξ147 μέγ' ἄνυσεν (Ποσειδάων urging forward the Achaeans) O321 ἄνυσεν (Ἴκτωρ) μάλα μέγα, etc. Mss Τρῳέσσιιν ὑμόκλα with a vicious contraction, this verb having been substituted for the sake of doing away with the closing iamb

157. Αἴαντες Several Mss Αἴαντε whilst retaining the plural ἐπιρριμένοι The original reading probably was Αἴαντε ἐπιρριμένω

158 ἀλκί A very strange dative as from a nominative ἀλκή I account for it in this way As I suggested in my note on v 47, Ἀλκιμομέδων (αλκ + ἰμος + μέδων) was syncopated into Ἀλκιμέδων, the first part of this served to form other proper names like Ἀλκίνοος Ἀλκίππη, and from its frequency was felt as a dative in accordance with numerous nouns forming their datives in -ί

160. μέγα ριάχων So Heyne (ριφάχων) after Bentley

161 to 164 Spurious For (1) σώματος should be σαώματος from σάως σαώω, as Σῶκος and ἐπισσώτρων should be Σάοκος and ἐπισαώτρων (2) ἄγραυλοι elsewhere applied to cattle or swine (3) πειναῶν with the initial of -άων long is impossible, how can the short -α- of this ending become exceptionally long in a handful of isolated verbs, those enumerated by vLeeuwen in his Enchiridion §190? (4) δῶν should be δῦο (5) δειδίξασθαι meaning to frighten is inappro-

prate to the context, we expect ἀπαλέξασθαι or ἀπαλάλκειν, cf. X348 οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅς σῆς γε κύνας κεφαλῆς ἀπαλάλκοι. The passage is a virtual copy of Γ23 ὥς τε λέων ἐχάρη μεγάλῳ ἐπὶ σώματι κύρσας πεινῶν, μάλα γάρ τε κατεσθίει εἴ περ ἂν αὐτὸν σεύωνται ταχέες τε κύνες θαλεροὶ τ' αἰζροὶ, a passage which itself exhibits several objectionable features.

161 αἰθωνα Were this verse genuine, I should write αἰθωνα as it stands in Ub. See note on v. 166.

165 καὶ νύ κέ ρ' ἐκφέρουσεν. Cf. 232 Πάτροκλον ἦπεκ βελίων ρεῦσαντες. Mss καὶ νύν κεν εἴρυσεν, but the verb is ρεῦω and its penultimate is short. Some Mss εἴρυσσεν, which is additionally defective on the score of a double σ effecting a long thesis.

ἄσπετον. The derivation from σπεν does not appeal to me. Possibly the primitive word was ἄσφατος as a syncopated form of ἀθέσφατος (see note on v. 47), the meaning being *untold*.

ἦρετο. So Brandreth. Mss ἦρατο.

166 Πηλείωνι. The correct form in -ωνι instead of -ωνι of the Mss reappears in Δολοπίονος Ἑρμῶνι Ἰήσονος Ἰησονίδης Κρονίωνος (X247, in B102 for Κρονίωνος one Ms gives Κρονίωνος) Ἰξιονίης Λυκάονος Μηριονίης Νομίονος (B871) πλείονος Ὑπερίονος Ὑπεριονίδης, etc.

ὦκεῖ Ἴρις. Also in v. 202. Cf. 399 A186 O158 Ω144 Ἴρι ταχεῖα. Hesiod Th. 266 ὦκεῖαν τέλει Ἴριν. Mss ὠλέα Ἴρις with a Herodotean feminine in -εα, unparalleled in Homer except in Ψ198 ὠλέα δ' Ἴρις, which can advantageously be emended into ὦκα (so Bentley) δ' ἄρ' Ἴρις. Editors retain ὠλέα and obviate the ensuing illegitimate hiatus by assuming that Ἴρις is digammated. But there is no adequate evidence in favour of *Ἴρις*. For (1) in 399 etc. βάσκι' ἴθι, Ἴρι, which might be appealed to as calling for a digamma, the hiatus is legitimate, there being a pause after ἴθι, such for instance as in Γ247 ἀλλ' ἄνα, εἰ μέμονας. (2) In 409 ὥς ἔφατ', ὥρτο δὲ Ἴρις and also Ψ201 δαινυντο, θέουσα δὲ Ἴρις ἐπέστη it is more in accordance with Homeric usage to say ὥρτο δ' ἄρ' (= ἐπειτα) Ἴρις and θέουσα δ' ἄρ' Ἴρις. But in their anxiety to restore an imaginary digamma editors have tampered with the following passages. (1) E353 τὴν μὲν ἄρ' Ἴρις, which Heyne or Thiersch altered into τὴν ἄρα *Ἴρις*, discarding μὲν, and

ἄγγελος ἦλθε θεοῦσ' ἀπ' Ὀλύμπου θωρήσσεσθαι,
 κρυβδὰ Διὸς ἄλλων τε θεῶν, πρὸ γὰρ ἦκέ μιν Ἥρη
 Ἀγχοῦ δ' Ἰσταμένη ρέπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγδρνε
 Ὅρσεο, Πηλεΐδῃ, πάντων ἐκπαγλῶτατ' ἀνδρῶν, 170
 Πατρόκλῳ ἐπάμυνον, οὗ ἕνεκα φύλοπις αἰνῇ
 ἔστηκε πρὸ νεῶν Οἱ δ' ἀλλήλους ὀλέκουσιν,
 οἱ μὲν ἀμυνόμενοι νέκνους πέρι τεθνηκότος,

thus obliterating a substantial feature of the context, for μὲν im-
 parts to τὴν the force of *so far as she was concerned* (2) E365 πὰρ δέ
 ροι Ἴρις ἔβαινε altered by Heyne into πὰρ δέ τε *F*ίρις ἔβαινε (one of
 the most atrocious conjectures I know, introducing as it does δέ τε)
 in spite of Γ262 πὰρ δέ ροι Ἀντήνωρ βήσεται preceded by ἂν δ' ἄρ' ἔβη
 Πριάμος, as E365 is similarly preceded by ἡ δ' ἐς δίφρον ἔβαινε The
 only passage which could justifiably be adduced in support of *F*ίρις
 is Ω117 ἀτὰρ ἐγὼ Πριάμῳ μεγαλήτορι Ἴριν ἐφῆσω, though even there
 the hiatus can be defended by such verses as ν114 ἡπεύρω ἐπέκλεισεν
 ὄσον (Mss ὄσον τ') ἐπὶ ἡμῖν πάσης We have therefore one doubtful
 instance in favour of *F*ίρις, as against several instances of ὠκεῖ' Ἴρις
 which support the undigamated form Consult further Hoffman
 Quest Homer 2-40

There is a second question pertaining to Ἴρις, viz whether the
 penultimate is long or short It has so far been taken as long be-
 cause with two exceptions it is found in the arsis, but this very
 constancy proves that it is only by position long The exceptions
 are (1) Δ27 τρεῖς ἐκάτερθ' ἱρισσι, which evidently must be corrected
 into τρεῖς ρεκάτερθεν ἱρισι (2) P547 πορφυρέην Ἴριν, where, though
 Ἴριδα can readily set the rhythm aright, the true reading I believe
 is νεφέλην If Ἴρις is derived from ἰ (εἶμι), then of course its initial
 iota must be short Perhaps also Ἰαιρα ("Ἰηρα ?) with its initial vowel
 short is from the same root

167 ἄγγελος ἦλθε θεοῦσ' ἀπ' Ὀλύμπου θωρήσσεσθαι The syntax is
 rather harsh for Homer's simple style Friedlander's ἀπ' Ὀλύμποιο

καρήνων would fit well as to the sense, but it is difficult to see how it could have become what we have in the text, especially as a verse ending with three spondees would have appeared objectionable to an amanuensis. Perhaps *θωρήξουσα* (cf B11 *θωρήξαι* *ρε* *κέλευε* *Ἀχαιοὺς*), the object *Πηλείονα* by prolepsis construed with *ἦλθε* and thus going over to the dative. A parallel passage is A715

168 *κρυβδά* So Bekker Cf *ἀμφαδὰ ἀναφανδὰ ἀποσταδὰ αὐτοσχεδὰ* and probably *μιγδά*. The accentuation *κρύβδα* perhaps induced by *κρύφα*

169 *ἀγχού* Van Leeuwen, who, following Brandreth, denies the legitimacy of the adverbial suffix *-ού*—though in γ16 he retains *ῥπου* without any adverse comment—writes *ἀγχι*. But I hold that the *-ού* suffix is sufficiently defended by the interrogative *ποῦ*. Besides, surely it is the same as the suffix of the genitive of the second declension, just as *παίτη* etc have assumed the suffix of the dative of the first declension

πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευε Mss *πετερόεντα προσηύδα* See note on v 72

170 *πάντων ἐκπαγλότατ' ἀνδρῶν* So in A146. But if in this place Homer is responsible for *ἐκπαγλότατε*, it must be admitted that he made a poor choice

171 *Πατρόκλῳ ἐπάμυνον* So a papyrius, some Mss, and Eustathios. Cf *ἐπαρήγω* (see note on v 99), *ἐπαρκέω* *τινί*. Most Mss *Πατρόκλου*. *ἔνεκα* Mss *εἵνεκα* See note on v 485

173 *τεθνηκός* Mss *τεθνηώς*. This participle is either *τεθνηκώς* as *τέθνηκα* *βεβρωκώς* *δεδαηκώς* *δέδρικα* (see note on v 261) *πέφυκας* *πεφρίκεναι* *τετυχηκώς*, or *τεθναώς* as *βεβαώς* *ἑσταώς* *γεγαώς* *πεπτεώς* *πεφύασι*. Such forms as *τεθνηώς* *βεβαρηώς* *κεκαφηώς* *κεκοτηώς* are fictitious. The genitive again can only end in *-ότος*, cf Ω20 *τεθνηότα* (read *τεθνηκότα* or *τεθναότα*) I345 *ρειδότος* δ447 *τετληότι* (read *τετληκότι* or *τετλαότι*) B170 and numerous other instances. In E708, and perhaps in N297 and 469 (for these two verses are in a spurious part), for *μεμηλώς* read *μεμηκώς* = *μεμαώς*. In μ85, were the verse genuine, *λελακνία* would manifestly be erroneous, for the antepenultimate is long, in a genuine verse we should have had *ιλάουσα*

- οἱ δὲ φερύσασθαι ποτὶ Φίλιον ἀνεμόεσαν
 Τρῶες ἐπιθύουσι μάλιστα δὲ φαίδιμος Ἑκτωρ 175
 ἐλκόμεναι μέμαεν, κεφαλὴν δέ ρε θυμὸς ἀνώγει
 πῆξαι ἀνὰ σκολόπεσι, ταμόνθ' ἀπαλῆς ἀπὸ δειρῆς.
 Ἄλλ' ἀνα μηδὲ κάθησο, σέβας δέ σε θυμὸν ἰκέσθω
 Πάτροκλον Τρωῇσι κυσὶν μέλπηθρα γενέσθαι·
 σοὶ λάβῃ αἶ κέν τι νέκυς ῥοχυμένος ἔλθῃ. 180
 Τὴν δ' ἡμέιβετ' ἔπειτα ποδάρκης δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς
 *Ἴρι θεὰ, τίς τ' ἄρ σε θεῶν ἐμοὶ ἄγγελον ἦκε,

174 (φ)ερύσασθαι. So most Mss. Most editors prefer ἐρύσασθαι, but the double σ only represents the usual metrical expedient. See notes on νν 28 and 36.

ποτὶ. Most Mss. προτί.

ἀνεμόεσαν. Mss. ἡνεμόεσαν, as οὐλομένη Οὐλυμπος, etc. See note on ν 616.

175 ἐπιθύουσι. This cannot be ἐπὶ + ἰθύω, for in that case the ypsilon would be short. It must be ἐπὶ + θύω (cf. θυμὸς ἐπιθυμῶ), the preposition as in ἐφίεμαι.

176. ἐλκόμεναι μέμαεν. So Bentley in accordance with ν 156 ἐλκόμεναι μεμαῶς. Mss. μέμονεν. In several passages μέμονα is found in the sense of μέμαα, but it is a question whether everywhere we should not correct μέμαα. The sense required is βουλομαι ὀργῶ, but μέμονα, being a derivative from μένω, cannot possess that sense.

ἀνώγει. Regarding this form instead of the variant ἄνωγε (the same variant in ν 426) see Enchir. § 225, where vLeeuwen remarks 'Verum olim perspexit P. Knight, cuius opinionem nunc egregie confirmant inscriptiones.'

177. σκολόπεσι. Mss. σκολόπεσσι. See note on ν 36.

178. μηδὲ κάθησο. Mss. give μηδ' ἔτι κείσο. But κείμαι signifies *to be stretched upon the ground* or *to be dead* or = τέθειμαι, *to be placed*, whereas the context demands the sense of *to sit about idly*, and this is rendered by ἡμαι or κάθημαι, cf. A415 αἰθ' ὄφελες παρὰ νηυσὶν ἀπη-

μων ἦσθαι The same blunder in H230, where κείται must give way to ἦστα.

179. Probably spurious and borrowed from P255.

180 ἥσχυμένος The variant ἥσχυμμένος is pseudo-metrical.

ἐλθῇ It is not clear how the dead body is to be recovered in the case supposed Μοῖρο Düntzer's conjecture εἶη is probably right, the optative as in A60 ἀπονοστήσειν αἶ κεν θάνατόν γε φύγοιμεν. However, the verse seems spurious. By its addition Iris's fervent exhortation loses much of its impressiveness, and the appeal to Achilles's honour as though his own fury to avenge Patroklos were not an overwhelming incentive strikes one like an anti-climax. The idea of this appeal was suggested by Sarpedon's appeal to Glaukos at Π498 σοὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ ἔπειτα (probably ἦ γὰρ ἐγὼ σοὶ ἔπειτα) κατηφείη καὶ ὄνειδος ἔσομαι, αἶ κέ μ' Ἀχαιοὶ τεύχεα συλήσωσι

181 to 201 Condemned by Naber Payne Knight had previously athetized vv. 185 to 186 and 192 to 195, Hoffman vv 181 to 186, Düntzer vv 182 to 187, Köchly vv 189 to 191. Against vv 200 and 201, which were borrowed from A800f and Π42f, we have Mss warrant, including that of papyi. All these verses are unworthy of Homer and abundantly infested with linguistic sores.

181 δῖος Ub δῖος, which palpably would be the genuine form. For out of about 300 passages where this adjective is encountered in the masculine gender there are only six where the penultimate must be long. Of these N195 is part of a supposititious episode, K439 and τ177 are easily excisable with advantage, M21 δῖος Σκάμανδρος appears in Hesiod Th 345 as θεῖος Σκάμανδρος, therefore the correct reading is θεῖος, similarly 1538 δῖον has been corrected by Düntzer into θεῖον, Π365 αἰθέρος ἐκ δίης seems to me an error for αἰθέρος ἐξ αἰθρῆς. The derivation of δῖος from δῖος is inadmissible; homerically there could ensue no contraction.

Ἀχιλλεύς Two Mss exhibit the proper spelling Ἀχιλεύς, see note on v 78

182 τίς τ' ἄρ Cf α346 τί τ' ἄρα See note on v 385. The variant τὰρ is worthless, not being homerical. The other variant γὰρ suits

Τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε ποδὴνέμος ὠκείᾳ Ἴρις Ἥρην με προέηκε, Διὸς κυδρὴν παράκοιτις, οὐδ' οἶδε Κρονίδης ὑψίζυγος, οὐδέ τις ἄλλος ἀθανάτων οἱ Ὀλυμπον ἀγάννιφον ἀμφινέμονται.	185
Τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς Πῶς τ' ἄρ' ἴω μετὰ μῶλον, ἔχουσι δὲ τεύχε' ἐκείνοι, μήτηρ δ' οὐ με φίλη πρίν γ' εἶα θωρήσσεσθαι πρίν γ' αὐτὴν ἐλθοῦσαν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσι ρίδωμαι στεῦτο γάρ Ἥφαιστοιο πάρ' οἰσέμεν ἔντεα καλά Ἄλλου δ' οὐ τευ ροῖδα τεῦ ἂν κλυτὰ τεύχεα δύω, εἰ μὴ Αἴαντος γε σάκος Τελαμωνιάδαο ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ὃ γ' ἔλπομ' ἐνὶ πρῶτοισιν ὀμιλεῖ, ἔγχει δηϊῶν περὶ Πατρόκλοιο θανόντος	190 195

well, but appears a correction of τάρ, cf 188 πῶς τ' ἄρ and πῶς τάρ, where a variant γάρ is only supported by two witnesses In A656 τίπτε τ' ἄρ' ὦδε read τί τ' ἄρα γ' ὦδε or τί τε δὴ ὦδε There are numerous passages where τάρ does not come in at all Cf A202 τίπτε' αὖτε Z254 τίπτε λιπῶν κ378 τίφθ' οὕτως, etc

186 ἀγάννιφον Homer I think would have written ἀγάννιφον, and so one Ms, cf Ἀγαμέμνων Ἀγαμήδη Similar faults are I think M30 ἀγάρρουι, A126 παλίλλογα, for which there is a variant παλίλογα, M33 καλλιρροον, but cf ρ206 καλλίρροον and κ107 καλλιρέεθρον

187 τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη Homei would have written δ' ἄρ' ἀμειβόμενος, respecting which I remarked in my note on X182 'Cf A292 τὸν δ' ἄρ' ὑποβλήδην ἡμίβετο X98 ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρ' ἔρεπε 260 τὸν δ' ἄρα προσέφη Similarly (ἐπεῖτα being equivalent to ἄρα) A121 τὸν δ' ἡμίβετ' ἐπεῖτα α44 314 γ210 θ338, etc The Mss instead of ἄρ' ἀμειβόμενος give ἀπαμειβόμενος, which compound, I have no doubt, is wrong It is only found in that common expression τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος, with a few exceptions These are. (1) η298 308 λ347 362 ι3 τὸν δ' αὐτ' Ἀλκίνοος ἀπαμειβετο φώνησέν τε, where it is possible to read ἡμίβετο, we have this reading, i e ἀμειβετο, as a variant in η298 (2) The next group of exceptions is Υ199 θ140 158 400 ρ445 τ405 ω327, where the phrase is exactly the same as the pre-

ceding one, save that instead of Ἀλκίνοος we have Αἰνείας (read Αἰνείης) Εὐρύαλος Ἀντίνοος Αὐτόλυκος Λαήρτης Here again (in θ400) there is a variant ἀμείβετο (3) In ρ405 we find τὸν δ' αὐτ' Ἀντίνοος ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη, but there is also here a variant τὸν δ' αὐτ' Ἀντίνοος ἀπαμείβετο φώνησέν τε, which brings this instance into line with the preceding ones Therefore it is only at first sight that ἀπαμείβεσθαι seems to occur frequently, in reality there are but two instances of its use, viz τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος and τὸν δ' αὐτ' Ἀλκίνοος ἀπαμείβετο On the other hand, the instances where the simple ἀμείβεσθαι occurs are many and various H356 ὅς μιν ἀμειβόμενος προσηύδα (?) δ464 ἀτὰρ ἐγὼ μιν ἀμειβόμενος προσέφημι Γ437 τὴν δὲ Πάρις μύθοισιν ἀμειβόμενος προσέφη Α604 αἶδον ἀμειβόμεναι ῥοπὶ καλῇ Ω200 κώκυσε δὲ γυνὴ καὶ ἀμείβετο μύθῳ Ψ489 ἀμείψασθαι ῥέπείεσσι(?) Γ171 τὸν δ' Ἑλένη μύθοισιν ἀμείβετο Ω372 τὸν δ' ἡμείβετ' ἔπειτα, and so forth'

188 ἔχουσι δὲ τεύχε' ἐκείνοι Very feeble

189 εἶα The homeric form is either ἦαε (Payne Knight η/αε), or ἦαε without augment Nauck's εἶαε is impossible, for ε cannot be augmented to ει, Nauck was misled by the later εἶα, the diphthong of which, however, was the result of the contraction of ε + ε after the intervening digamma dropt out of use So ἐρέργω = εἶργω At this verse εἶα is due to the interpolator's ignorance

192 to 195 A rhapsodo assutos esse nemo, qui attente legerit, dubitabit nam structura ipsa sententiae τεῦ οἶδα, τεῦ ἄν, etc, ab Homericis elegantia aliena est PAYNE KNIGHT

192 τεῦ Auffällig das Interrogativum statt des zu erwartenden Relativs FAESI-FRANKE

193 εἰ μὴ Αἴαντος An impossible hiatus

194 καὶ αὐτὸς δ' γ' ἔλπομαι(αι) ἐνὶ πρώτοισιν ὁμιλεῖ Apart from the fact that neither ἔλπομαι nor ὁμιλεῖ are homeric forms, the idea that Achilles might entertain any doubts as to Ajax being in the thick of the fray betrays the interpolator, for it is too absurd for Homer or any sane poet to have penned it.

195 δηϊῶν Homerically this would be δαιῶν

Τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε ποδὴννεμος ὤκέα Ἴρις
 Εὖ νυ καὶ ἡμεῖς ρίδμεν ὃ τοι κλυτὰ τεύχε' ἔχονται
 ἀλλ' αὐτῶς ἐπὶ τάφρον ἰὼν Τρώεσσι φάνηθι,
 αἱ κέ σ' ὑποδρῖσαντες ἀπόσχωνται πολέμοιο 200
 Τρῶες, ἀναπνεύσῃσι δ' ἀρήιοι νῖες Ἀχαιῶν
 τειρόμενοι, ὀλίγη δέ τ' ἀναπνευσίς πολέμοιο
 Ἢ μὲν ἄρ' ὥς φασμένη ἀπέβη πόδας ὤκεϊ' Ἴρις.
 Ἀτὰρ Ἀχιλεὺς ὥρτο διίφιλος—ἀμφὶ δ' Ἀθήνη
 ὥμοισ' ἰφθίμοισι βάλ' αἰγίδα θυσσανδέσσαν—
 ἀμφὶ δέ ροι κεφαλῇ νέφος ἔστεφε δια θεάων 205
 χρύσειον, ἐκ δ' αὐτοῦ δαῖε φλόγα παμφανόωσαν
 Ὡς δ' ὅτε καπνὸς ἰὼν ἐξ ἄστεος αἰθέρ' ἵκηται
 τηλόθεν ἐκ νήσου τὴν δῆϊο ἀμφιμάχονται,
 οἱ τε πανημέριοι στυγερῶ κρίνονται Ἀρηι
 ἄστεος ἐκ σφετέρων, ἅμα δ' ἡελίῳ καταδύντι 210
 πυρσοὶ τε φλεγέθουσιν ἐπήτριμοι, ὑψόσε δ' αὐγῇ
 γίνεται αἴσσουσα περικτιόνεσσι ριδέσθαι,

197 εὖ νυ καί Also in ©463 and τ501, where read ἦ for εὖ. In our passage εὖ instead of ἐν is of course due to the interpolator

199. ἀπόσχωνται πολέμοιο *That they might refrain from beginning a battle* But what the context demands is *that they might refrain from continuing the battle*, and this would be expressed by ἐπίσχωνται, cf ν266 μνηστήρες, ἐπίσχετε θυμὸν ἐδωδῆς φ71 μύθου ἐπισχεσίην The same correction required at Λ799 and Ξ78

200. ἀρήιοι νῖες The genuine forms are ἀρείοι and νοί, see notes on νν 2 and 76

201 δέ τε. See note on ν 106

202 ἡ μὲν ἄρ' ὥς φασμένη ἀπέβη Cf ν429 ὥς ἄρα μιν φασμένη λ150 ὥς φασμένη ἱβη X460 ὥς φασμένη διέσσυτο E290 835 κ446 σ206. X247 ὥς φασμένη καὶ (read ροι) κερδοσύνη ἡγήσατο The Mss ἡ μὲν ἄρ' ὥς εἰποῦσ' ἀπέβη, where the real form ρεποῦσα does not fit the rhythm.

ἄρα = ἔπειτα to be construed with ἀπέβη.

ὤκεϊ' Ἴρις Mss ὤκέα Ἴρις See note on ν 166

205 to 214 Verses condemned by Düntzer. They are indeed very inferior, the hyperbole of the simile is particularly repugnant.

205 δια If the feminine of *δῖος*, it should be *διῇ* But perhaps formed independently after *πρίσβα πάντα*

206 ἐκ δ' αὐτοῦ δαίε φλόγα The simile borrowed from E4.

παμφανόωσαν Were this verse truly from Homer, I should write *παμφανόεσσαν*, see note on v. 144 But the interpolator conformed to the false suffix *-όωσαν* which had established itself by his time.

207 καπνὸς ἰὼν ἐξ ἄστεος Suggested by Φ522 ὡς δ' ὅτε καπνὸς ἰὼν εἰς οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἰκάνει *ῥάστεος αἰθομένοιο* According to information from Dionysios the Thracian, Aristarchos, being offended by the absurdity of likening a fire to smoke, altered (*μεταθέσθαι*) the reading to *πῦρ ἐπὶ πόντον ἄριπρεπές* I may add that *μεταθέσθαι* in the Scholia, contrary to Ludwig's opinion 1-93, means *to alter by conjecture*

209 οἷ τε grammatica ratione vix alii esse possunt quam *δήϊοι, obsidentes*, atqui hoc non convenit *Ἡεῖνε* The verse was bodily transferred from B385 (with the alteration of ὡς κε to οἷ τε) without the interpolator considering whether his addition fitted the context

πανημέριοι It has been made to do duty for *during the day* in contrast to the happenings during the night, but, as in B385, it really means *all the day long* Cf also v 453 πᾶν δ' ἡμᾶρ μάραντο

210 ἄστεος ἐκ σφετέρου The besieged, who according to v 213 were in imminent danger of destruction, are by these words represented as boldly making daily sorties Zenodotos imagined that he could mend matters by his tame suggestion *ἄστν περι σφέτερον*

211 πυρσοί τε As *ῥιδίσθαι* depends upon *φλεγέθουσιν* and so the sentence *ὑπόσε δ' αὖτ' ἡ γίνεται αἰσσοῦσα* is parenthetical, the conjunctive τε remains in the air

212 γίνεται αἰσσοῦσα A strange periphrasis for *αἰσσει*, and stranger still is the conception which represents a beacon-fire as if it were lightning Furthermore, *ἐπήτριμοι* in the sense of *διηνεκείς* was not a felicitous choice La Roche, among other examples illustrative of the periphrasis—none I think to the point—refers to X219 *πεφυγμένον γενέσθαι*, but that is a misreading of *πεφυγμένον νέεσθαι*

219 to 221. Spurious It is *ρόπα χάλκεον* of v 222, borrowed from Sophokles, that has suggested this simile to the interpolator, who was unskilful to the extent that he has left us uncertain whether the *σάλπιγξ* was sounded by the besieged or the besiegers By the use also of (1) *θυμοραιστέων*, (2) *περιπλομένων* for *περικαθημένων*, (3) *ὅτε τε*, (4) *ἀριζήλη* for *ἀριδήλη* or rather *ἀριδαέλη*, (5) *φωνὴ γένητο*, and (6) by the omission of a verb, he shows himself inexperienced in homeric diction and metric, and generally in the Greek language

σάλπιγξ The Scholiast 'αὐτὸς (Ὁμηρος) οἶδε σάλπιγγα, χρωμένους δὲ τοὺς ἥρωας οὐκ εἰσάγει.' A decisive remark True, we find *σάλπιγξεν* in Φ388, but the whole narrative of the battle of the gods is allowed to be a recent intrusion As regards his further remark that *κόλχῳ δὲ θαλασσίῳ ἐσάλπιζον*, there is no mention of such a *κόλχος* in Homer, the voice doing duty for it I may mention that shells are still employed in the Islands; I heard a watchman sound one at night in Rhodes, their sound is loud and weird.

222 οἱ δ' ὥς οὖν ἄιον *ρόπα χάλκεον* There is something amiss in this phrase, for neither can *χάλκεον* be used as a feminine nor is there an occasion for οὖν, which indeed is absent from one Ms. *Χάλκεον* seems a reminiscence of Soph Aj.16 *φώνημι' ἀκούω χαλκοστόμου κώδωνος ὡς Τυρσηνικῆς*

Αἰακίδαο Homerically *Αἰακίδεο* See note on v 93

223 *πᾶσι δ' ὀρίνθη* Mss *πᾶσιν ὀρίνθη*

ἵπποι δ' ὅχα κρότεον Cf O452 *ὑπερώησαν δέ ροι ἵπποι κείν' (?) ὅχα κροτέοντες* A160 *κείν' ὅχα κροτάλιζον*. Soph. El 714 *κροτητῶν ἀρμάτων* Mss *τρόπεον*, which is encountered neither in Homer nor, so far as I know, elsewhere, *τρωπάω* (cf *στρέφω-στρωφάω νέμω-νωμάω*) is the form extended from *τρέπω*, but *τρώπαον*, which we have as a variant, does not fit the rhythm

224 *δίσαντο γὰρ ἄλγεα θυμῷ* Cf τ390 *κατὰ θυμὸν οἶσατο* v349 *γόον (?) δ' ὥϊετο θυμός* ξ298 *τῷ ἐπόμενος περ ἀνάγκη* Mss *ὄσσοιτο*, which does not signify *suspected* or *feared* as the context requires, but *saw*. In O172 *κακὸν ὄσσομένην* read *κάκ' ὄψαμένην*

225 to 227. Condemned by Düntzer along with vv 205 to 214.

δρυνὸν ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς μεγαθύμου Πηλείωνος
 δαίόμενον, τὸ δὲ δαΐε θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη
 Τρὶς μὲν ἄρ' ἀπ' ὄχθου μέγα ρίαχε δῖος Ἀχιλεὺς,
 τρὶς δὲ κυκλήθησαν Τρῶες κλητοὶ τ' ἐπικούροι
 Ἐνθα δὲ καὶ τότε δλοντο δυνάδεα φῶτες ἄριστοι
 ἄμα σφαίρῳ ἵπποισι καὶ ὄχεσιν

230

Ἄτὰρ Ἀχαιοὶ

ἀσπασίως Πάτροκλον ὑπὲκ βελίων ρεῦσαντες,
 κάτθεσαν ἐν λεχέεσι. Φῖλοι δ' ἀμφέσταν ἑταῖροι

The interpolator represents the matter as if only the charioters became terror-stricken at the sight of the flashes darting from Achilles's head, adding moreover a perfectly useless piece of information in v. 227

228 τρὶς μὲν ἄρ' ἀπ' ὄχθου The Mss τρὶς μὲν ὑπὲρ τάφρου See note on v 215

μέγα ρίαχε So Bekker Mss μεγάλ' ἵαχε See note on v 29

229 κλητοὶ τ' ἐπικούροι So the auxiliaries are called from having been invited to come to the assistance of the Trojans, cf P221, where Hector says οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ πληθὺν διζέμενος οὐδὲ χατίζων ἐνθάδ' ἀφ' ἡμετέρων πολιῶν ἤγειρα (1 θ ἐκάλεσα) ρέκαστον With the exception of Payne Knight all editors, at least all such as I have consulted, favour everywhere the variant κλειτοί, I presume because it strikes them as more poetical For the same reason probably they prefer ἐπικούροι τηλεκλειτοί, *far-renowned*, to τηλεκλητοί, *called from afar*, but in this case the point is settled in favour of τηλεκλητοί by an ἐπίκουρος himself, for at E478 Sarpedon declares καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἐπίκουρος ἐὼν μάλα τηλόθεν ἦκω Such a τηλεκλητὸς ἐπίκουρος was Nestor when he joined the army of Perithoos, as he expressly relates at A269 ἐλθὼν τηλόθεν ἐξ ἀπῆς γαίης, καλέσαντο γὰρ αὐτοί Cf also πολύκλητοι and πολυηγεεῖς The same adjective κλειτή is wrongly joined with ἐκατόμβη at Δ102 120 H450 Ψ864, having supplanted κριτή = ἐπίλεκτος, *picked* Cf v181 ταύρους κεκρμένους (= κριτοὺς) ἱερεύσαμεν ξ108 συνὼν τὸν ἄριστον εὐ κρίνας Δ696 ἀγέλην τε βοῶν καὶ πῶν ὁίων κρινάμενος

Why should a *ἐκατόμβη* be designated *κλειτή* or *ἀγακλειτή*? The same adjective *κριτούς* must originally have stood in I165 *ἀλλ' ἄγετε* (*ἀλλ' ἄνδρας*?) *κλητούς ὀτρύνομεν*, as a comparison with I520 *ἄνδρας δὲ ῥλίσσεσθαι ἐπιπροέηκεν ἀρίστους κρινάμενος* clearly shows In ι308 *ἤμελγε κλυτὰ μῆλα* I suggest *ἤμελγεν ἐρῶ*

230 *Ineptissimum rhapsodi commentum, commissura hiantē insertum Poeta, quamvis non nimis modestus in summo heroe augendo et ornando, nominatim et sigillatim, non ita cumulatim, φωτας ἀριστους εἰ occidendos tradere solet* PAYNE KNIGHT

ἐνθα δὲ καὶ τότε ὄλοντο Probably *ἐνθα δ' ἀπὸ τότε ὄλοντο*, i e *ἀπόλοντο*, for *καὶ τότε* should refer to something similar having happened at some other time, of this there is no trace

δυῶδεκα. Were the verse genuine, I should write *δυόδεκα* Both *δυό* and *δύω* are diffused widely through our texts, but both forms cannot concurrently be right, see note on v 36 In all but a few cases *δυό* can be altered into *δύο* without the rhythm suffering so long as we admit tribrachs and in a lesser degree iambs In 332 *δύω ἐρίηρες* was corrected by Payne Knight into *δυο περιηρες* See also notes on vv 507 509 523 525

231 (*κυκήθησαν*) *ἄμα* (an iamb in what the Alexandrians called *στίχος ἀκέφαλος*) *σφοῖς ἵπποισι καὶ ὄχεσιν*, *fell into disorder together with their horses and chariots* Cf 237 *σὺν ἵπποισι καὶ ὄχεσι* E219 M114 119, etc Mss *ἀμφὶ σφοῖς ὀχέεσσι καὶ ἐγχεσιν*, in which *κυκήθησαν ἀμφὶ ὀχέεσσι* is hard to understand, and still more so *κυκήθησαν ἀμφὶ ἐγχεσιν* But, notwithstanding its evident depravation, our text has had its admirers One of them was Apollonios Rhodios, who in his *Argonautica* 2-830 inserted *ἀλλά μιν Ἰδας οὔτασε, βεβρυχῶς δὲ θοῶ περικάππεσε δουρί* Another admirer added the words *τε τοῖς δορατίοις* καὶ in Thuc 7-84 *περὶ τε τοῖς δορατίοις καὶ σκεύεσιν οἱ μὲν εὐθὺς διεφθείροντο, οἱ δὲ ἐμπαλασσόμενοι (?) κατέρρεον*

ἀτάρ Mss *αὐτάρ* See note on v 148

232. *ἀσπασίως*. Cobet and Nauck *ἀσπάσῳ*

233 *ἐν λεχέεσι* So one Ms Commonly *λεχέεσσι*, see note on v 36. Probably *ἐνὶ λέχεσι*.

- μυρόμενοι, μετὰ δέ σφι ποδώκης εἶπετ' Ἀχιλεὺς
 δάκρυα θερμὰ χέων, ἐπεὶ εἶσσιδε πιστὸν ἑταῖρον 235
 κείμενον ἐν φέρτρῳ δεδαιγμένον ὀξεί χαλκῷ.
 Τὸν ἦτοι μὲν ἔπεμπε σὺν ἵπποισι καὶ ὄχεσιν
 εἰς πόλεμον, οὐ δ' αὖτις ἐδέξατο νοστήσαντα
 Ἄελιον δ' ἀκάμαντα βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη
 πέμψεν ἐπ' Ὀκεανοῖο ροὰς ἀρέκοντα νέεσθαι 240
 ἀέλιος μὲν ἔδν, παύσαντο δὲ δῖοι Ἀχαιοὶ
 φυλῶπιδος κρατερῆς καὶ Ὀλοοῖο πολέμοιο.
 Τρῶες δ' αὖθ' ἐτέρωθεν ἀπὸ κρατερῆς ὑσμίνης
 χωρήσαντες, ἔλυσαν ὑφ' ἄρμασιν ὠκέας ἵππους,
 ἐς δ' ἀγορὴν ἀγέροντο πάρος δόρποιο μέδεσθαι. 245
 Ὅρθῳ δ' ἐσταῦτων ἀγορὴ γένητ', οὐδέ τις ἔτλη
 ἐξέσθαι πάντας γὰρ ἔχε τρόμος οὐνεκ' Ἀχιλεὺς
 ἀψ' ἐφάνη, ὀρηρὸν δὲ μάχης ἐπέπαυτ' ἀλεγεινῆς.
 Τοῖσι δὲ Πολυδάμας πεπνυμένος ἤρχ' ἀγορεύειν
 Πανθοίδης ὁ γὰρ οἷος ὄρα πρόσσω καὶ ὀπίσω 250
 Ἔκτορι δ' ἦεν ἑταῖρος, ἱγ' δ' ἐν νυκτὶ γέγοντο
 ἄλλ' ὁ μὲν ἄρ' μύθοισιν, ὁ δ' ἔγχει πολλὸν ἐνίκα
 Ὅ σφιν ἐνφρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέρπειν
 Ἀμφὶ μάλα φράζεσθε, φίλοι Κέλομαι γὰρ ἐγὼ γε
 ράστυδε νῦν ἵναι, μὴ μίμνειν ἡδὲ δῖαν 255

237 τὸν ἦτοι *Mss* τὸν ῥ' ἦτοι The particle was no doubt added in order to produce a spondee

ὄχεσιν. So Brandreth (οχεσσιν) *Mss* ὄχεσφιν, which represents an attempt at eliminating the dibrach

238 οὐ δ' αὖτις I do not follow why editors, passing over this Alexandrian reading, prefer οὐδ' αὖτις, thus throwing the emphasis upon αὖτις, the stress lies upon the negative.

239 ἀέλιον *Mss* ἡέλιον See note on v 61

241. ἀέλιος As above.

δῖοι. *Mss* δῖοι See note on v 181

242. Ὀλοοῖο πολέμοιο Cf Γ133 Ὀλοοῖο λιλαιόμενοι πολέμοιο *Mss*

ὁμοίον, which is atrocious as to form (the nominative being ὁμοῖος and not ὁμοίος) and incomprehensible as to rhythm. The disfigurement prompted by a desire to eliminate an iamb Nauck's suggestion ὁλοῖοσ, though suited to sense, is impossible as to form, the nominative being ὁλοός, the genitive can only be ὁλοοῦ or ὁλοοῖο (and possibly ὁλοόφο). In γ236 for θάνατον ὁμοῖον perhaps ὁλέθριον.

247 οὔνεκα The contraction from οὐ + ἔνεκα I very much distrust. Possibly ὁ καί. And possibly τὸ καί for τούνεκα. Cf M8 θεῶν δ' ἀέκητι τέτυκτο, τὸ καὶ οὐ τι πολλὸν χρόνον ἔμπεδον ἦεν σ392 ἦ νύ τοι αἰεὶ τοιοῦτος νόος ἐστίν, ὃ (read ἐστὶ, τὸ) καὶ μεταμῶνία βάλλεις

248 ἂψ ἐφάνη Mss ἐξεφάνη The like correction to be made at T46 Y43 κ260 That this is the proper reading is proved by οἱ δ' ἄμ' αἰστώθησαν ἀρρολλέες οὐδέ τις αὐτῶν ἐξεφάνη of κ260, for there ἂψ ἐφάνη is imperatively demanded by the context.

ἀλεγεινῆς. A word difficult to explain. Considering its meaning it should come not from ἀλέγω but ἀλγος, cf. A398 δδύνη δὲ διὰ χροός ἦλθ' ἀλεγεινῇ, but in that case it should be ἀλγεινῆς

249 Πολυδάμας So two Mss. For the common lection Πουλυδάμας see note on v 616.

ἦρχ' ἀγορεύειν Perhaps ἦρχ' ἀγοράων Cf B433 and γ68 μύθων ἦρχε. A781 ἦρχον μύθοιο. α367 ἦρχετο μύθων

250 to 253 Condemned by Duntzer They contain the following objectionable features. (1) ὄρα instead of ὄραε (2) πρόσσω with its penultimate in the thesis of a spondee (3) ἰῆ instead of μίη (4) ἄρ without any meaning (5) the tautological v. 253 (6) ἐνίκα instead of ἐνίκας, or rather ἐκαίνυτο or ἐκέκαστο, for νικάω in the sense of *to be superior* has intruded from the Scholiasts, cf. E124 κέκαστο, Schol 'ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐνίκα,' γ282 ἐκαίνυτο, Schol 'τὸ δὲ ἐκαίνυτο ἐνίκα'

254. ἀμφὶ μάλα φράζεσθε On peut joindre la préposition au verbe, car ἀμφιφράζομαι signifie *deliberer* PIERRON

255 ἵναι This and ἵμεναι are the genuine epic forms, see note on v 14 Mss ἰέναι

ἦδα So Payne Knight. Mss ἦω. See note on v. 136

δίαν Mss δῖαν. See note on v 205

ἐν πεδίῳ παρὰ νηυσὶ ρεκάς δ' ἀπὸ ράστεός εἰμεν.
 Ὅφρα μὲν οὗτος ἀνὴρ Ἀγαμέμνονι μῆνιε δῖφ,
 τοφράδε ραῦτεροι πολεμίζειν ἦσαν Ἀχαιοί.
 Χαίρεσκον γὰρ ἐγὼ γε θοῆσ' ἐπὶ νηυσὶν ἐλαύνων,
 νέας ρελπόμενος αἶρσέμεν ἀμφιρελίσσας· 260
 νῦν δ' αἰνῶς δέδρικα ποδώκεα Πηλεΐονα
 Οἷος ἐκείνου θυμὸς ὑπέρβιος, οὐκ ἐθελήσει
 μῖμνεῖν ἐν πεδίῳ, ὅθι περ Τρῶες καὶ Ἀχαιοὶ
 ἐν μέσῳ ἀμφότεροι μίνος Ἀρης δατέονται,
 ἀλλὰ περὶ πόλιός τε μαχίγεται ἡδὲ γυναικῶν 265
 Ἀλλ' ἴομεν προτὶ ράστῃ, πίθεσθέ μοι, αἰνὰ γὰρ ἔσται
 Νῦν μὲν νῦξ ἀπέπαυσε ποδώκεα Πηλεΐωνα

256. ράστεος So Brandreth, though hesitatingly Mss τείχεος.
 εἰμεν Qu ἔσμεν

258 τοφράδε, *thou then* So apparently also in Δ221 M12 O343, and
 probably elsewhere Mss τόφρα δὲ with a presumed antithesis to the
 foregoing μὲν, to which, however, the antithesis is in v 261

ραῦτεροι That the first syllable is ρα- we may be assured from
 the Attic ράδιος ράων The positive would be ράος, of which the ad-
 verbial neuter plural only is found This from metrical reasons has
 assumed the form ρεῖα, whence the alternative form ρέα in those
 cases where a short penultimate is demanded by the rhythm Mss
 ρήτεροι, which is a monster, as it presupposes a positive ρήσις

ραῦτεροι πολεμίζειν Scholia 'εὐκαταμαχητότεροι, ὥστε τὸ πολεμίζειν
 ἀντὶ τοῦ πολεμίζεσθαι' Not necessarily Cf Thuc 6-42 ῥάονες ἄρχειν
 7-51 χαλεπωτέρους προσπολεμῶν (i e ῥάων ἄρχειν αὐτῶν, χαλεπώτερον
 προσπολεμῶν αὐτοῖς or αὐτοῦς)

259 θοῆσ' ἐπὶ νηυσὶν ἐλαύνων Cf E327 Δ274 400 νηυσὶν ἐπὶ γλαφυ-
 ρῇσιν ἐλαυνόμεν. And in a hostile sense O259 νηυσὶν ἐπὶ γλαφυρῇσιν
 ἐλαυνόμεν ἵππους Ω392 ἐπὶ νηυσὶν ἐλάσας Ἀργείους κτείνεσκε The last
 quotation illustrates besides the iterative χαίρεσκον Mss ἰαύων, un-
 intelligibly, at least to me

260. νέας ρελπόμενος Mss ἐλπόμενος νῆας for metrical reasons, as Αχιλλῆος τοκῆων Ἄρης, etc For, the true forms of νηῦς are νεὸς νέες νέας νεῶν νέεσι (or νηυσὶ), which are very frequently encountered and by analogy with which the accusative singular must be νέα and the dative νέι, though the former is only found once at 1283 and the latter has entirely disappeared An instructive passage is Π366 which runs ὡς τῶν ἐκ νηῶν γένετο ριαχὴ, whereas closely upon it at v. 376 we have ἀπορρον (ἀπορρον?) προτὶ ράστν νεῶν ἀπο In B152 for ἄπτεσθαι νηῶν ἡδ' ἐλκόμεν read ἄπτεσθαι τε νεῶν ἡδ' ἐλκόμεν

261 δέδρικα To this leads δέδρια, see note on v 173. Mss δέδοικα, in which the diphthong is inexplicable

Πηλείονα Mss Πηλείωνα See note on v 166

262 to 265 Spurious They imply that Achilles only on this occasion would think of going to battle for the conquest of Troy, and that never during the previous ten years had this occurred to him Then there are other indications of their spuriousness (1) ἀμφοτέρω, as though it were possible for one side to fight alone. (2) μένος ἄρης δατέονται is a puzzle (3) ἄρης with its long penultimate in the thesis betrays one who was not familiar with true homeric diction, see my note on v 134 (4) περὶ πόλιος μαχέσεται would be appropriate to a defender (5) οἷος ἐκείνον θυμὸς ὑπέρβιος taken from ο212

265 περὶ πόλιος μαχέσεται Homerically περὶ πόλιος μαχέσεται. See notes on vv. 64 and 59.

266 αἰνὰ γὰρ ἔσται Cf π255 αἰνὰ βίας ἀποτίσσει The Mss ὧδε γὰρ ἔσται, a change thought of as suited to introduce the subsequent spurious verses Some ancient student seems also to have objected to our text and proposed in Ms H ὡς γὰρ ἄμεινον, which is found in A217 and Hesiod Op.570.

267-283 Versus hi mihi semper visi sunt superius dictorum vim infringere, copia vana otiosaque, et iteratione eorum quae iam melius dicta erant Insunt quoque nonnulla duriter dicta vss 272 274 282, etiam vidi contra digamma peccari vss [270] 274 Probabile itaque mihi fit, serius haec a rhapsodo assuta esse more sollenni

- ἀμβροσίῃ εἰ δ' ἄμμε κιχῆσεται ἐνθάδ' ἰόντας
 αὔριον ὀρμηθεὶς σὺν τεύχεσιν, εὖ νύ τις αὐτὸν
 γνώσεται, ἀσπασίως γὰρ ἀφίξεται Ἴλιον ἱρὴν 270
 ὅς κε φύγῃ, πολλοὺς δὲ κύνες καὶ γῦπες ἔδονται
 Τρώων Αἱ γὰρ δὴ μοι ἀπ' οὐατος ὧδε γένοιτο
 Εἰ δ' ἂν ἐμοῖς ρεπέεσσι πιδώμεθα κηδόμενοι περ,
 νύκτα μὲν εἰν ἀγορῇ σθένης ἔξομεν, ἄστρῳ δὲ πύργοι
 ὑψηλαί τε πύλαι σανίδες τ' ἐπὶ τῆς ἀραρυῖαι 275
 μακραί ἐύεστοι ἐξευγμέναι εἰρύσσονται
 πρῶτ' ὃ ὑπηοῖοι σὺν τεύχεσι θωρηχθέντες
 στησόμεθ' ἄμ πύργους Τῷ δ' ἄλγιον αἰ κ' ἐθέλησιν
 ἐλθὼν ἐκ νηῶν περὶ τείχεος ἄμμι μάχεσθαι
 ἅψ πάλιν εἰς ἐπὶ νῆας ἐπεί κ' ἐριαύχνας ἵππους 280
 παντοίοις δρόμοις ἀσθρὺν ὑπὸ πτόλιν ἡλασκάζων
 Εἴσω δ' οὐ μιν θυμὸς ἐφορμηθῆναι εἴσει,
 οὐδέ ποτ' ἐλπίρσει πρὶν μιν κύνες ἄργοι ἔδονται
 Τὸν δ' ἄρ' ὑπὸδρα βιδὼν προσέφη κορυθαίολος Ἔκτωρ
 Πολυδάμαν, σὺ μὲν οὐκέτ' ἐμοὶ φίλα ταῦτ' ἀγορεύεις, 285
 ὃς κέλεαι κατὰ ράστυ ραλέμεναι αὐτίς ἰόντας
 ἼΗ οὐ πῶ κεκόρησθε ρεφεργμένοι ἐνδοθι πύργων,
 Πρὶν μὲν γὰρ Πριάμοιο πόλιν μέροπες ἄνθρωποι

declarandi uberius ac dilatandi breviter et cum vi dicta HEYNE
 The verses are thoroughly bad

268 ἄμμε Wrongly employed in the plural, as vLœuwen has
 pointed out The same blunder in v 279

269 εὖ It should be ἐύ

αὐτόν It should be μιν or ρε

272 ὧδε. This, in the same way as ὡς (see note on v 86), is employed
 in cases of wish In Z281 for ὡς κέ ροι αὐθι χάνοι read ὧδε

273 εἰ δ' ἂν ἐμοῖς ρεπέεσσι This should read εἰ δέ κ' (perhaps, εἴ
 ἄγ') ἐμοῖσι ρέπεισσι (read ρέπεισι), as vLeeuwen writes

κηδόμενοι περ It cannot signify *though disappointed* as the inter-
 polator meant it

274 σθένης ἔξομεν Meaningless Possibly λέχος ἔξομεν, *shall sleep*,
 though that even would be unsatisfactory Οἱ perhaps λεξόμεθα
 owing to the undigammated ἄστρῳ

276. ἐξευγμέναι This seems to be the only case in Homer where the verb is used in any but the literal sense of yoking to a chariot.

LEAF

εἰρύσσονται. This can only mean *will draw*, and not *will save*, for which the verb is ῥύσμαι (σρύσμαι)

279. νῆων It should be νεῶν, and in the following verse νέας instead of νῆας See note on v 260

281. ὑπὸ πτόλιν ἡλασκάζων *Skulking towards and under the city* Of course the διασκευαστής meant to say that Achilles would fruitlessly roam round under the city, this should have been expressed by ὑπὸ πτόλι ἀλαόμενος Similarly at v 278 he should have said στησόμεθ' ἄμ πύργοισι.

282. ἑάσει. It should be ἐνήσει, as Heyne remarks, οἱ ἀνέσει See note on v 108

283. οὐδέ ποτ' ἐκπέρσει. As if to sack the city were a lesser evil than the wish to attack it

285. Πολυδάμαν So Bekker (Πουλυδάμαν), following Zenodotos. Aristarchos's editions had Πουλυδάμα, not because the great critic considered this the proper form, for it was easy to see that from a genitive Πολυδάμαντος the vocative must be Πολυδάμαν, as Αἴαν Θόαν, but because his staunch conservatism would not allow him to interfere with the traditional reading which was Πουλυδάμα See note on v 321 There is a curious note at A86 to the effect that whilst Aristarchos wrote Κάλχαν contrary to his Πουλυδάμα, Zenodotos on the other hand, inconsistently with his reading Πουλυδάμαν, preferred Κάλχα

286. ραλέμεναι Mss ἀλγήμεναι See note on v 14

287. ρερεγγμένοι So several documents in the sense of *being incarcerated* in agreement with the context, all editors have preferred ἐελέμενοι or ρερελέμενοι, which means *crowded together* The same reading it seems to me should be adopted in Ω662, 1 e ρερεγγμεθα in the place of the Mss ἐέλεμεθα

288 to 292. Objected to by Hentze, who was misled through giving γάρ a causal sense as explanatory of the previous sentence

πάντες μυθέσκοντο πολύχρυσον πολύχαλκον
 νῦν δὲ δὴ ἐξαπόλωλε δόμων κειμήλια καλὰ, 290
 πολλὰ δὲ δὴ Φρυγίην καὶ Μηονίην ἐρατεινὴν
 κτήματα περνάμεν' ἵκει, ἐπεὶ μέγας ὠδύσατο Ζεὺς
 Νῦν δ' ὅτε δὴ μοι ἔδωκε Κρόνου παῖς ἀγκυλομήτεω
 κύδος ἀρέσθ' ἐπὶ νηυσὶ καὶ ἀμφ' ἄλα ῥέλσαι Ἀχαιοὺς,
 νήπιε, μηκέτι ταῦτα νοήματα φαίν' ἐνὶ δῆμῳ 295
 οὐ γάρ τις Τρώων ἐπιπείσεται, οὐ γὰρ ἑάσω
 Ἄλλ' ἀγεθ' ὥς ἂν ἐγὼ ρείπω πειθώμεθα πάντες

But γὰρ here means *the matter stands thus*, cf. Thuc 2-83-2 Its tenoi is not very different from that of δη

291. πολλὰ δὲ δὴ (a variant καὶ Φρυγίην καὶ Μηονίην (regarding the variant Μηονίην see note on v 28) κτήματα περνάμεν' ἵκει With δὲ δὴ the text reads as if these markets would only buy other goods than the κειμήλια mentioned in the preceding verse, and this I cannot believe could have been meant by Homer Probably instead of πολλὰ δὲ δὴ Φρυγίην the original text was πολλὰ γὰρ ἐς Φρυγίην

293 ὅτε δὴ Strongly attested and recurring at A432 493 Γ15 Z191 and frequently, also τότε δὴ at A494 Commonly preference is given to the variant ὅτε περ for some reason unknown to me For, so far as I can trace, this combination recurs in (1) Ξ319 323, which unanimously are allowed by ancient and modern critics to be spurious (2) Y188, which likewise stands in an episode admitted to be supposititious (3) K7, where we find ὅτε πέρ τε, the verse thus being padded with two expletives, a feebleness of which even a very minor poet would not be guilty, in fact, it has been condemned by such eminent critics as Heyne, Doederlein, and Nauck (4) Δ259, where ὅτε πέρ τε reappears (5) E802 καὶ ῥ' ὅτε περ (notice again two expletives) ἐγὼ πολεμιζόμεν οἶκ' εἶασκον οὐδ' ἐκπαιφάσσειν ὅτε τ' ἦλυθε δαίνυσθαι μιν ἄνωγον, a thoroughly corrupt passage, which probably has to be corrected by καὶ ποτε πάρος (cf A453) ἐγὼ πολεμιζόμεν οὐ ρ' ἦασκον οὐδ' ἐκτοσθάξειν(?) ὁπότ' ἦλυθε δαίνυσθαι δέ ρ' ἄνωγον (6) T57 ὅτε νῶε περ, for which I do not see at present a ready remedy

We have therefore one or at most two examples in favour of ὅτε περ as against a mass in favour of ὅτε δὴ = *when at last*

ἔδωκε Κρόνου παῖς ἀγκυλομήτεω Also Δ75 Nauck corrects the grammar by his suggestion ἀγκυλόμητις conformably to the variants at Δ59, Hesiod Theog 473, Op 48 But if ἀγκυλόμητις signifies *crooked-minded*, the difficulty is transferred to the sense, for such an epithet is too derogatory to apply to Zeus An additional flaw is the short syllable before Κρόνου I have thought of νῦν δ' ὅτε δὴ μοι ἔδω (cf ἔδομεν δῶ) Κρόνου ἀγκυλομήτιος ὅς, but it is too uncertain

294 καὶ ἀμφ' ἄλα ρέλσαι So Heyne, referring to the parallel A409 Mss θαλάσση τ' ἔλσαι with an imperfect construction and with the digamma neglected

295 νοήματα φαῖν' ἐνὶ δῆμῳ I should think that νοήμαθ' ὕφαιν' ἐνὶ δῆμῳ would better express Hector's indignant mood, he would thus spitefully insinuate that Polydamas's speech concealed dark plotting Cf. ι122 δόλους καὶ μῆτιν ὕφαινον In Γ212 the tradition fluctuates between ἔφαινον and ὕφαινον

296 ἐπιπείσεται The force of ἐπὶ in ἐπιπείθομαι is not clear Perhaps ὑποπείσεται in analogy with ὑπορρίκω Cf A294 εἰ σοι πᾶν ῥέργον ὑπορρίξομαι (so Bentley) Accordingly, read ὑπορρίκτον for ἐπιρρίκτον in E892

297 to 309 I look upon all these verses as an inept accretion They spoil the effect of Hector's short and stern answer, which ends fittingly with a determined οὐ γὰρ εἴσω And it is further probable that vv 300 to 302 are the work of a second falsifier, who meant them to follow v 296, but from the margin they seem to have been erroneously inserted, so that now they split the military instructions Vv 300 to 302 have been deleted by Payne Knight

297 ὥς ἂν ἐγὼ ρέπω Were this verse genuine, I should write ὥς κεν ρέπω (see note on v 94) ἐγὼ This true reading has been preserved in M75 (εἴπω ἐγὼ) in one Ms, as well as in M317, where all Mss give ὅφρα τις ᾧδ' εἴπῃ, i e ᾧδε ρέπῃ, as Payne Knight wrote (ρεπῇ)

πειθόμεθα The interpolator's mistake for πιθόμεθα

Νῦν μὲν δόρπον ἔλεισθε κατὰ στρατὸν ἐν τελείεσσι
 και φυλακῆς μνήσασθε καὶ ἐγρήγορθε βέκαστος
 Τρώων δ' ὅς κτεάτεσσιν ὑπερφιάλως ἀνιάζει, 300
 συλλέξας λαοῖσι δότῳ καταδημοβορῆσαι
 τῶν τινα βέλτερον ἴσιν ἐπαυρέμεν ἢ περ' Ἀχαιοῦς
 Πρῶτ' δ' ὑπηροῖοι σὺν τεύχεσι θωρηχθέντες
 νησὶν ἐπὶ γλαφυρῇσιν ἐγείρομεν ὄζυν' Ἄρηα
 Εἰ δ' ἔτεόν παρὰ ναῖφιν ἀνέστη δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς, 305
 ἁλγίον, αἰ κ' ἐθέλῃσι, τῷ ἴσεται οὐ μιν ἐγὼ γε
 φεύξομαι ἐκ πολέμοιο δυσσχέος, ἀλλὰ μάλ' ἄντην
 στήσομαι, ἥ κε φέρῃσι μέγα κράτος ἢ κε φεροίμην
 Ξυνὸς Ἐνυάλιος καὶ τε κτανέοντα κατέκτα
 ὦ Ως Ἐκτωρ ἀγόρευε, ἐπὶ δὲ Τρῳῆς κελάδησαν, 310
 νήπιοι! ἐκ γάρ σφι φρένας εἰλετο Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη
 Ἔκτορι μὲν γὰρ ἐπήνεσαν ὀλοὰ μητιάοντι,
 Πολυδάμαντι δ' οὐ, ὅς σφισιν ἐσθλὴν φράζετο βουλήν
 Δόρπον ἔπειθ' εἰλοντο κατὰ στρατόν
 Ἀτὰρ Ἀχαιοὶ

298 Suggested by Λ730

299. ἐγρήγορθε An extraordinary form, I cannot believe that it was syncopated from ἐγρηγόρατε, 'urgente metro' as vLeeuwen states O metie, as Madame Roland might say, combien d'excentricités on met sur ton compte! This theory of *urgente metro* has held the field for two thousand years, and it is time that it should be laid. Is there any language in which even mediocre poets are so utterly unresourceful as occasionally to be unable to form their verses without distorting its words?

300 ὑπερφιάλως An adverb which would be right where the sense of *arrogantly* is required by the context as in α227 ὑβρίζοντες ἱπερφιάλως, but where the meaning is *excessively*, it seems to me to have supplanted ὑπερφυέως, as for instance in ρ481 and σ71 In this place the interpolator must have taken it in good faith from other passages as = ὑπερφυέως Attic writers employ ὑπερφυέως commonly as = *exceedingly*

301. καταδημοβορῆσαι. As a derivative from δημοβόρος of A231 it means just the reverse to what the interpolator intended it to stand for Eustathios with unconscious humour remarks 'ἐκεῖ μὲν ὁ δυνάστης ὁ τὰ τοῦ δήμου βιβρώσκων, ἐνταῦθα δὲ [the tables being turned] δημοβορεῖν τὸ αὐτὸν τὸν δῆμον τὰ τῶν δυνατῶν ἐσθίειν'

305 εἰ δ' ἐτεδὸν ἀνέστη Ἀχιλλεύς. As if Hector were not certain that Achilles was about to re-enter the war, but heard it as a vague rumour.

παρὰ ναῦφιν. What does this mean? If *near the ships*, it should be παρὰ νηυσὶν or νέεσιν, if *starting from his own ship*, it should be παρὰ ναῦθεν.

306 αἶ κ' ἐθέλῃσι. Van Herwerden's αἶ κ' ἐλθῇσι vitiates the interpolator's idea, he meant Hector to dare Achilles to come forth and face him. Cf. 278 τῷ δ' ἄλγιον, αἶ κ' ἐθέλῃσιν ἄμμι μάχεσθαι. Ψ553 πειρηθῆτω ὅς κ' ἐθέλῃσιν ἐμοὶ μάχεσθαι.

308 ἥ κε φέρῃσι μέγα κράτος ἥ κε φερόιμην. Why one verb in the active voice with the subjunctive and then the other in the middle voice with the optative?

309 καί τε κτανέοντα κατέκτα. I doubt if even the interpolator could have joined two copulatives. The syntax seems to be κατέκτα τε καὶ κτανέοντα, thus καὶ being intensive.

311 ἐκ γάρ σφι φρένας εἴλετο Παλλὰς. Mss σφέας. The correction is vLeeuwen's, who refers to I377 ἐκ γάρ ροι φρένας εἴλετο Ζεὺς and T137 καί μοι φρένας ἐξέλετο Ζεὺς, where the rhythm does not admit the genitive. Add Z234 Γλαῦκῃ Κρονίδης φρένας ἐξέλετο. α9 ἀτὰρ οὐ τοῖσιν ἀφείλετο ἡμαρ.

312 ἐπήνεσαν ὁλοὰ μητιόντι. Cf. II701 ὁλοὰ φρονέων. λ276 ὁλοὰς διὰ βουλὰς. Mss κακὰ unrhythmically. It was in order to discard the tribrach that κακὰ along with the fanciful forms ἐπήνησαν and ἐπήνεσαν were introduced. Regarding the double σσ see note on v 36.

μητιόντι. Mss μητιώντι. Payne Knight constantly writes -ύων -ύοντος instead of the traditional -ύων -ύωντος.

313 Πολυδάμαντι δ' οὐ, ὅς σφισιν ἐσθλήν. Mss Πουλυδάμαντι (see note on v 616) δ' ἄρ' οὐ τις ὅς ἐσθλήν, in which ἄρα is meaningless.

παννύχιοι Πάτροκλον ἀνεστέναχον γοάοντες 315
 Τοῖσι δὲ Πηλεΐδης ἀδινοῦ ἐξήρχε γόοιο
 χείρας ἐπ' ἀνδροφόνους θέμενος στήθεσιν ἐταίρου,
 πυκνὰ μάλα στενάχων, ὥς τις θῆρ ὕληγενῆς,
 ᾧ ρά θ' ὑπὸ σκύμνους ἐλαφοβόλος ἀρπάσῃ ἀνὴρ
 ὕλης ἐκ πυκινῆς, ὃ δ' ἄρ' ἄχνυται ὕστερος ἐλθὼν, 320
 πολλὰ δ' ὃ γ' ἀγκ' ἐλήλυθ' ἐπ' ἀνέρος ἵχνε' ἐφέπων
 εἰ ποθεν ἐξεύροι, μάλα γὰρ δριμύς χόλος εἶλε
 ὥς ὁ βαρὺ στενάχων μετεφώνεε Μυρμιδόνεσιν

315 ἀνεστέναχον γοάοντες So Fick here and at v 355 Mss ἀνεστε-
 νάχοντο γοῶντες with a non-homeric contraction I thought myself
 of Ἀχαιῶν ἀνεστενάχοντο γέροντες and at v 355 Μυρμιδόνων γέροντες
 Cf T338 ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γέροντες 189 γέροντας Ἀχαιῶν 576 γέροντες
 Αἰτωλῶν But I now consider Fick's conjecture simpler and more
 probable

318 to 322 Objected to by Düntzer But the picture seems to
 me to be full of life and successfully to match Achilles's mood
 of distress and anger combined It has been pointed out that the
 description answers a lioness, this is true, but I presume Homer
 has used θῆρ generically Düntzer extends his objections down to
 v 355

318 ὥς τις θῆρ ὕληγενῆς Cf p449 ὥς τις θαρσαλέος καὶ ἀναιδὴς προί-
 κτης. Mss ὥς τε, but with this we should have an iamb followed by
 a spondee and then by another iamb, a succession of feet the like
 of which I cannot find elsewhere

θῆρ Mss λῖς Several Mss exhibit λῖς with a grave accent in ac-
 cordance with Aristarchos's accentuation, thus taking the vowel
 as being short It seems to me clear that λῖς or λῖς has supplanted
 θῆρ from the Glossists Alberti in Hesychios quotes Schol Apoll
 Rhod 1-1243 θῆρ ἄγριος κυρίως οἱ ποιηταὶ τὸν λέοντά φασιν Schol
 Cyrill Lex Ms θηρός ἀντὶ τοῦ λέοντος Add Schol A546 θηρί λέοντι
 (and reversely) λέοντα θῆρα Hesych θῆρ ὁ λέων θηρί λέοντι θηρός

λέοντος Apoll Lex. θήρ κατ' ἐξοχὴν ὁ λέων Accordingly in Λ480 in stead of λῶν I read θήρ

ὀληγενής Formed as ἐυγενής αἰθρηγενής Mss ἡνυγένειος = *well-bearded* I could understand a lion admired for his mane but not for a beard which he does not possess, beards are a characteristic of goats As a denizen of the jungles a lion is ὀληγενής. Cf. also Hes Oper 529 κεραοὶ καὶ νήκεροι ὀληκοῦται M299 λέων ὄρεσίτροφος, virtually = θήρ ὀληγενής The change no doubt arose from the tendency to restore what was supposed to be an indispensable rhythm.

319 ᾠ ρά θ' The last particle belongs to the pronoun, as it does also in Γ61 I504, and not to ρά

ἐλαφοβόλος Mss ἐλαφηβόλος as if the first part were ἐλάφη and not ἐλαφος

320 ὁ δ' ἄρ' (= ἔπειτα, see note on v 37) ἄχνυται Mss ὁ δέ τ' ἄχνυται See note on v 106 In the succeeding verse δ' ὁ γ' is my correction for δέ τ'

321 ἄγκε' ἐλήλυθε' ἐπ' (= ἐπελήλυθε) ἀνέρος ἵχνε' ἐφέπων For ἄγκε' ἐπελήλυθε cf δ268 πολλὴν δ' ἐπελήλυθα γαίαν, for ἀνέρος ἵχνε' ἐφέπων cf Λ496 ἔφεπεν δαΐζων ἵππους τε καὶ ἀνέρας μ330 ἄγρην ἐφέπεσκον The Mss ἄγκε' ἐπῆλθε μετ' ἀνέρος ἵχνη' ἐρευνῶν, where the contracted form of the verb is not homeric, and μετ' ἀνέρος ἵχνια yields a lame construction whether it be construed with ἐπῆλθε or with ἐρευνῶν The last word was without doubt intruded to effect a spondee The phrase ἵχνη' ἐρευνῶντες recurs in τ436, but that verse is spurious. In χ180 τεύχε' ἐρεῦνα the proper reading is likewise τεύχε' ἔφεπε, cf Z321 τεύχε' ἔποντα ξ195 ἄλλοι δ' ἐπὶ βέργον ἔποιεν (i.e. ἐφέποιεν).

ἵχνε' So Barnes Mss ἵχνη' Van Leeuwen at N71 'vitio natus pluralis ἵχνια redit Z321 Ψ764 β406 γ30 ε193 η38 τ436.' Guided by the proximate ἄγκεα Aristarchos would not have suffered ἵχνια in his editions had he not felt himself debarred from interfering with what he found in his documents. See note on v 285

322 εἰ ποθεν ἐξεύροι Brandieth's conjecture εἰ ποθι /' ἐξευροι probably represents the primitive reading

εἴλε. A past tense as ἐλήλυθε The Mss unhomericallv αἰρεῖ

- ὦ ποποῖ, ἦ ῥ' ἄλιον ῥέπος ἔκβαλον ἡματι κείνῳ
 θαρσύνων ἥρωα Μενότιον ἐν μεγάροισι 325
 φῆν δέ ροι εἰς Ὀπέντα περικλυτὸν ὕδ' ἀπάξειν
 Φίλιον ἐκπέρσαντα λαχόντα τε ληΐδος αἶσαν.
 Ἄλλ' οὐ Ζεὺς ἀνδράσι νοήματα πάντα τελέει
 ἄμφω γὰρ πέπρωται ἅμ' αὐτὴν γαῖαν ἐρεῦσαι
 αὐτοῦ ἐνὶ Τροίῃ, ἐπεὶ οὐδ' ἐμὲ νοστήσαντα 330
 δέξεται ἐν μεγάροισι γέρων ἱππηλάτα Πηλεὺς
 οὐδὲ Θέτις μήτηρ, ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ γαῖα καθέξει.
 Νῦν δ' ἐπεὶ οὔν, Πάτροκλε, σέυ ὕστερος εἰμ' ὑπὸ γαῖαν,
 οὐ σε πρὶν κτεριῷ πρὶν γ' Ἐκτορος ἐνθάδ' ἐνεῖκαι
 τεύχεα καὶ κεφαλὴν, μεγαθύμου σείω φονῆος, 335
 δώδεκα δὲ προπάρουθε πυρῆς ἀποδειροτομήσω
 Τρώων ἀγλαὰ τέκνα, σέθεν κταμένοιο χολωθείς
 Τόφρα δέ μοι παρὰ νηυσὶ κορωνίσσι κείσεται αὐτως,
 ἀμφὶ δέ σε Τρῳαὶ καὶ Δαρδανίδες βαθύκολποι
 κλαύσονται νύκτας τε καὶ ἡματα δάκρυ χέουσai, 340
 τὰς αὐτοὶ καμόμεσθα βίηφί τε δουρί τε μακρῷ
 πιείρας πέρθοντε πόλεις μερόπων ἀνθρώπων
 ὦς φάμενος ἐτάροισιν ἐκέκλετο δῖος Ἀχιλεὺς
 ἀμφὶ πυρὶ στήσαι τρίποδα μέγαν, ὄφρα τάχιστα

324 ποποῖ So Aristarchos Cf. παπαῖ ὁτοτοῖ αἰαῖ ἀτταταῖ See Lehrs p 118 Mss πόποι

325 Μενότιον Mss Μενοίτιον See note on v. 455

326 εἰς Ὀπέντα περικλυτὸν ὕδ' ἀπάξειν Probably ἀνάξειν. Cf O29 ἔνθεν ῥυσάμην(?) καὶ ἀνήγαγον αὐτὶς Ἄργος ἐς ἱππόβοτον, where a scholion says 'οἱ δὲ γράφουσιν ἀπήγαγον' The verb ἀνάγω somehow seems to have puzzled the ancient grammarians, for at σ89 ἀναγον there is a variant ἄγαγον and a remark 'Ἵωνες τὸ ἄγειν ἀνάγειν λέγουσιν' And at σ203 ἀνάγουσι there is a scholion 'ἀντὶ τοῦ ἄζουσι'

327 ληΐδος Payne Knight λεΐδος See note on v 28

328 οὐ Ζεὺς ἀνδράσι νοήματα πάντα τελέει Cf 74 τὰ μὲν δὴ τοι τετέλεσται ἐκ Διὸς τ561 οὐδέ τι πάντα τελέεται (Mss τελείεται) ἀνθρώποισι, and often The Mss reading τελευτᾶ is metrical.

ἀνδράσι This is the form mostly met with (see note on v 91) in both epics, but in some twenty passages, including this, we find **ἀνδρεσσι**. It is easy to perceive the reason why, it was invented in order to bring in the cherished **-εσσι** (see note on v 36), and thus create dactyls in substitution of tribrachs

329 **ἄμφω γὰρ πέπρωται ἄμ' αὐτὴν γαίαν ἐρεῦσαι**. *It is pre-ordained that we both together redden the same earth*. For **ἄμφω ἅμα** cf μ424 **ἄμφω συνέβηγον ὁμοῦ** Hymn Herm 39 **χερσὶν ἄμ' ἀμφοτέρησιν**. For **αὐτὴν γαίαν** cf. θ107 **αὐτὴν ὁδόν** Mss **πέπρωται ὁμοίην**.

333 to 342 Condemned by Köchly and Naber. These verses contain not only wrong words—such as **σεῦ, σείο, δώδεκα δὲ προπάροιθε**—which can readily be corrected by **σέ', σοῖο, δυόδεκα δὲ πάροιθε** (or **πάρορθε**), but also the following very unsatisfactory expressions **σειο φονῆος, σίθεν κταμένοιο χολωθείς, καμόμεσθα, πόλεις** or **πόλιν** instead of **πόλιας**. Then Faesi-Franke remark to the point 'Daran, dass Hector seine eigenen Waffen anhat, denkt er auffälliger Weise nicht'. It follows that vv Φ26 to 33 and Ψ22 with 23 must equally go

341 **καμόμεσθα** Scholia '**μετὰ καμάτου ἐκτησάμεθα**'. This of course is the meaning intended, but **κάμνω** signifies *to make by hand*. It is wrongly employed also in ι130

343 **φάμενος** Mss **εἰπών** See note on v 202

ἐτάροισιν As I remarked in my note on v. 109, this form appears non-homeric. Then there is this to be considered, that, as we see from Ω587, it was the women's business to wash and lay out a corpse. It may be, therefore, that instead of **ἐτάροισιν** the original lection was **δμῳῆσιν**, in which case we should have further to correct **ἐλοῦσαι** and **θεῖσαι** instead of **ἐλόντες** and **θέντες** in vv 347 and 352. Or perhaps **θεράπονσιν**, who generally in Homer carry out orders for jobs

344 **ἀμφὶ πυρὶ στήσαι τρίποδα** Cf Ψ270 **ἀμφίθετον φιάλην ἀπύρωτον**. Soph. AJ 1404 **ὑψίβατον τρίποδ' ἀμφίπυρον λουτρῶν** Aeschylos Fr 1, however, says **τρίπους λίβης φυλάσσων τὴν ὑπὲρ πυρὸς στάσιν** as if he found **ἀνὰ πυρὶ**

Πάτροκλον λοίσειαν ἀπο βροτὸν αἱματόεντα. 345
 Οἱ δὲ λοετροχόον τρίποδ' ἴστασαν ἄμ πυρικοίτη,
 ἐν δ' ἄρ' ὕδωρ ἔχεαν, ὑπὸ δὲ ξύλα δαίον ἐλόντες
 Γάστρην μὲν τρίποδος πῦρ ἀμφεπε, θέρετο δ' ὕδωρ·
 ἀτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ ζέσεν ὕδωρ ἐνὶ βόλνοπι χαλκῷ,
 καὶ τότε δὴ λόεσάν τε καὶ ἤλειψαν λίπ' ἐλαίῳ, 350
 ἐν δ' οὔτειλὰς πλήσαν ἀλείφατος ἐννέωροιο,
 ἐνυλεχέεσι δὲ θέντες, ἐανῶ λιτὶ κάλυψαν
 ἐς πόδας ἐκ κεφαλῆς, καθύπερθε δὲ φάρει λευκῷ
 Παννύχιοι μὲν ἔπειτα πόδας ταχὺν ἀμφ' Ἀχιλῆα
 Μυρμιδόνες Πάτροκλον ἀνεσπενάχοντο γοῶντες 355
 Ζεὺς δ' Ἥρην προσέρεπε κασιγνήτην ἄλοχόν τε
 "Ἐπρηξας καὶ ἔπειτα, βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη,
 ἀνστήσας' Ἀχιλῆα πόδας ταχύν ἧ ρά νυ σέο
 ἐξ αὐτῆς ἐγένοντο κερηκομόεντες Ἀχαιοί

345 *λοίσειαν* and v. 350 *λόεσαν* So Payne Knight (*λοῖσειαν* and *λοῖσαν*) Mss *λούσειαν* and *λοῦσαν* But cf 316 *λοετροχόον*, where the rhythm forbids *λουτροχόον* Noi does v 489 admit *λουτρῶν* The same is the case in Ξ6 X444 445 Ψ44 θ451, etc As regards the verb a good example is Φ560 *λοεσάμενος* and not *λουσάμενος*

346 ἄμ πυρικοίτη *Over the fire receptacle* This noun exists in Anthol. Pal 6-294 as an adjective (see Liddell and Scott) In Arist An 436 it is called *πυριστάτης* and in Paus. Thoc 26 9 *ὑποστάτης*, the passage running *ὑποστάτης τε λίθου καὶ λουτήριον ἔστιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὑποστάτῃ χαλκοῦν* Mss *ἐν πυρὶ κηλέω*, which is both unintelligible and rhythmically defective Palaeographically the lapse would be more easily accounted for if the original reading was *πυριβηλῷ*, with *βηλός = basis*, but I cannot trace any other example of *βηλός = basis*, though I suspect that in Θ441 *ἄρματα δ' ἄμ βωμῶσι τίθη* the right word is *βήλοισι*.

For like changes of *ἀν* into *ἐν* cf Ψ702 *τρίποδ' ἄμπυριβάτην*, which in our Mss appears as *ἐμπυριβήτην* M63 *σκόλοπες ἀν'* (Mss *ἐν*) *αὐτῇ ἰστᾶσιν* H441 *ἀν* (Mss *ἐν*) *δὲ σκόλοπας κατέπηξαν*

347 ἄρ' Clarke *deinceps*.

348 *θέρετο* This is the genuine homeric form, or *θερμαίνω* from *θερμός* Mss *θέρμετο* from *θέρμω*, which sounds barbarous.

349 *ζέσεν* A variant *ζέσσαν*, see note on v. 36

ροίνοντι The variant *ῥινοσι* is incomprehensible to me; other students seem to be more fortunate in grasping its meaning

351 *οὔτειλās* Mss *ᾠτειλās*. But the word is a derivative of *οὔτάω*, whence then the change of *ου* to *ω*? It is further probable that its real form is *οὔτηλās*, because I do not see how *α* could have been extended into *ει*.

ἐννεώροιο Another incomprehensible, and moreover unrhythmical, word

354 and 355 A repetition and amplification of v 315 after its debasement

356 to 367 Verses condemned by an Alexandrian grammarian of the name of *Ζηνόδωρος*, a condemnation seconded by modern critics Payne Knight calls them 'episodium inficetum' They are certainly not brilliant as poetry, still their diction presents nothing very objectionable To me they seem a natural addition in that the gods had deeply interested themselves in the Trojan affairs, and when these reached such a decisive culmination as Achilles's re-entry into the fray, something should be said as a notice of this event on Olympus This is Pierion's view, who comments 'les evenements sont de ceux qui meritent particulièrement l'attention des dieux'

356 *κασιγνήτην ἄλοχόν τε* Probably *κασιγνήτην τ' ἄλοχόν τε*.

357 *ἔπρηξας* Without an object as in A562 *πρήξει δ' ἔμπης οὔ τι δυνήσεται*, where *τι* is not an object to *πρήξει* as has been assumed, but must be construed with *οὔ* Cf 386 *οὔ τι θαμίζεις* a75 *οὔ τι κατακτείνει* τ561 *οὐδέ τι πάντα τελέεται*, etc

καὶ ἔπειτα La Roche refers to Γ290 O140 II498 β60 θ510 520 φ131 ω432

358 *σείο* Mss *σείο* In my note on X106 I pointed out that in many passages the forms *έμέο* and *σείο* are demanded by the rhythm At v 392 the Mss fluctuate between *σείο* and *σίο*

359 *καρηκομόεντες* Mss *καρηκομώντες* See note on v. 144.

Τὸν δ' ἡμίβητ' ἔπειτα βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη·	360
Ἀινότατε Κρονίδη, ποῖον νῦν μῦθον ἔρεπες.	
Καὶ μὲν δὴ πού τις ἄλλη θεὸς ἀνδρὶ τέλεσε·	
ὅς περ θνητός τ' ἐστὶ καὶ οὐ τόσα μῆδεα ροῖδε	
πῶς δὴ ἐγὼ γε, ἣ φημι θεάων ἔμεν ἀρίστη,	
ἀμφοτέρων, γενεῇ τε καὶ οὐνεκα σὴ παράκοιτις	365
κέκλημαι, σὺ δὲ πᾶσι μετ' ἀθανάτοισι βανάσσεις,	
οὐκ ὄφελον Τρώεσι κοτεσαμένη κακὰ ῥάψαι,	
ὧς οἱ μὲν τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγόρευον.	
Ἥφαίστου δ' ἔκανε δόμον Θέτις ἀργυρόπεζα	
ἄφθιτον ἀστερόεντα, μεταπρεπέ' ἀθανάτοισι,	370
χάλκεον, ὃν ῥ' αὐτὸς ποιήσατο κυλλοποδίῳ.	
Τὸν δ' εὖρε ριδίωντα βελισσόμενον περὶ φύσας,	
σπεύδοντα Τρίποδας γὰρ ἐείκοσι πάντας ἔτευχε	
ἐστάμεναι περὶ τοῖχον ἐσταθέος μεγάροιο	
Χρύσεια δέ σφ' ὑπὸ κυκλα βεκάστω πυθμένι θῆκεν,	375

360 πότνια Ἥρη A suspicious hiatus Perhaps πότνια θεά

361 ποῖον (perhaps οἶον) νῦν μῦθον ἔρεπες Mss ποῖον τὸν μῦθον ἔειπες The article of course is inadmissible, I have substituted νῦν as the most plausible correction To this leads the similar passage ε183 οἷον δὴ τὸν μῦθον ἐπεφράσθης ἀγορεύσαι, the tone of which is reproachful, there the conjecture δὴ νῦν is I think pretty safe, this combination accompanying like reproachful utterances at Γ403 and 405 As regards ἔρεπες see note on v. 94.

362 ἄλλη θεὸς (feminine as in 307 and ε194) ἀνδρὶ τέλεσε. Hera, asserting her pre-eminent rank among goddesses, claims that, if ever it has happened that another goddess not her equal has wreaked her vengeance upon mortals, for instance, Artemis as related at I533, she has a better right to a similar privilege Mss μέλλει βροτὸς ἀνδρὶ τελέσσαι, in which Hera debases herself by her comparison with a mortal The iambs probably helped the misreading.

363 The foregoing correction necessitates the excision of this

verse, the more so as the phrase οὐ τόσα μῆδεα οἶδε creates a climax in absurdity

364 ἔμεν Mss ἔμμεν See note on v 14

367. Τρώεσι and κοτεσσαμένη Mss Τρώεσσι and κοτεσσαμένη See note on v 36

368. τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγόρευον A short vowel preceding πρὸς is not permissible Probably μετ' ἀλλήλοισ' ἀγόρευον Cf Z375 μετὰ δὲ δμωῆσιν ἔρπεε, etc.

370. μεταπρεπέ' ἀθανάτοισι Quod alibi εκπρεπέα HEYNE Perhaps μετ' εκπρεπέ' ἀθανάτοισι, 1 e μετ' ἀθανάτοισι, cf B482 Ἀτρείδην εκπρεπέ' ἐν (= μετὰ) πολλοῖσι ἡρώεσι

371. With κυλλοποδίῳ this verse concludes with an iamb See note on v 486

372 τὸν δ' εὖρε ριδίωντα So Zekidis Mss τὸν δ' εὖρ' ἰδρόνonta with the digamma violated

373 τρίποδας ἔτευχε ἐστάμεναι The syntax as Y495 ὅτε τις ζεύγη βόας τριβέμεναι κτῆ ζ89 τὰς μὲν σέων ποταμὸν πάρα τρώγειν ἀγρωστὶν η92 οὓς Ἥφαιστος ἔτευξεν δῶμα φυλασσέμεναι 151 ἐμοὶ πομπὴν ὀτρύνετε πατρίδ' ἰκίσθαι χ120 τόξον πρὸς σταθμοὶ ἐκλιν' (probably ἄγκλιν') ἐστάμεναι

374 ἐστάμεναι περὶ τοῖχον The tripods were to be placed round the room against the walls as β341 πίθοι ροίνιοιο ἔστασαν ἐξείης ποτὶ (most probably περὶ) τοῖχον ἀρηρότες Cf besides η95 θρόνοι περὶ τοῖχον ἐρηρέδατ' ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα.

375 to 377 Condemned by Düntzer The interpolator was not content with the vivid delineation of Hephaistos drawn by Homer, but wished to make us marvel at his supernatural power of working wonders To him also we owe the description of wonders at vv 417ff η91f and probably τ230 231 The idea of imparting life to tripods was probably at first suggested to him by κέλευε λ' ἐργάζεσθαι of v 469 See note on v 477.

375. κύκλα This neuter recurs in another spurious passage, that of E722 to 732.

πυθμένι This also in the sense of ποδὶ is found in a spurious verse, 1 e A635

ὄφρα ροι αἰτόματοι θεῖον δυσαίατ' ἀγῶνα
 ἥδ' αὖτις πρὸς δῶμα νεοίατο, θαῦμα ριδέσθαι.
 Οἱ δ' ἦτοι μὲν τόσον ἔχον τέλος, οὐατα δ' οὐ πω
 δαιδάλεα προσέκειτο· τὰ ῥ' ἤρτυε, κόπτε δὲ δεσμούς.
 "Ὅφρ' ὃ γε ταῦτ' ἐπένετο ἰδυίησι πραπίδεσιν, 380
 τόφρα ροι ἐγγύθεν ἦλθε θεὰ Θέτις ἀργυρόπεζα·
 τὴν δὲ ρίδε προμολούσα Χάρις λιπαροκρήδεμνος
 καλὴ, τὴν ὥπυιε περικλυτὸς ἀμφιγυβείς,
 ἐν τ' ἄρα ροι φῦ χειρὶ ρέπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε
 Τί τε, Θέτι τανύπεπλε, ἰκάνεις ἡμέτερον δῶ, 385
 αἰδοῖή τε φίλῃ τε, Πάρος γε μὲν οὐ τι θαμίζεις
 Ἄλλ' ἔπειο προτέρω ἵνα τοι παρ ξείνια θέω

376 *δυσαίατ' ἀγῶνα* Borrowed from the spurious verse H298 It is a very peculiar phrase

378 οἱ δ' ἦτοι μὲν τόσον ἔχον Which some rhapsodist or grammarian, in his ignorance that *τόσσον* with a long penultimate is fictitious, altered into οἱ δ' ἦτοι τόσσον μὲν ἔχον in order to efface the tribrach

οὐατα The special mention of the ears or handles must represent a tradition from those times when, the art of attaching handles to earthen vessels having only recently been discovered, they were considered a special ornament That is the reason why the tripod given as a prize at Ψ264 is *οὐατόεις*, namely of a particularly valuable quality A good illustration of the value attributed to the ears is the Mycenaean vessel exhibited in the Museum at Athens, the ears of which are ornamented with doves And I may mention that many years ago, before I saw that vessel or its representation in Helbig, I guessed that *δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον*, which has caused so much trouble to archaeologists, was an old corruption of *δέπας ἀμφιπέλειον*, a *cup ornamented with doves* (doves were a popular kind of ornamentation; see Helbig p 24) *right and left* I was led to this conjecture by the description in Λ633 *οὐατα δ' αὐτοῦ τέσσαρ' (τέσσαρ' ?) ἔσαν, δοιαί δὲ πελειάδες ἀμφὶ ρέκαστον* Theocritus's *κισσίσβιον ἀμφῶες*

shows that the fashion of viewing the ears of vessels as an ornament prevailed still as late as his own times; unless he imitated the homeric ἄλεισον ἄμφωτον of χ¹⁰

380 ἐπένετο Mss ἐπονέιτο, which is not homeric. The same correction required in B409 I12 Ψ681 ο222 π13 ν307.

ἰδυῖνσι πραπίδεςαι This participle is not convincing as to either sense or form. How could it be formed from ρειδώς? Perhaps πυκινῇσι, cf Ξ294 πυκινὰς φρένας. O461 πυκινὸν νόον. The change probably from a tendency to discard the iamb in the fourth foot.

πραπίδεςαι So a papyrus Mss πραπίδεςσαι. See note on ν 36.

383 ἀμφιγυοίς Mss ἀμφιγυήεις, which is pseudo-metrical (see note on ν 31), being a derivative of γύον it must end in -οίς. Similar malformations in κοτήεις ὑψιπετήεις

384 ἐν τ' ἄρα Probably ἐν δ' ἄρα, both here and at ν 423. There are innumerable examples of δ' ἄρα, but extremely few of τ' ἄρα. One is at ν 37, where see note

φῦ Two Mss φύ. See note on ν 140

385 τί τε. This particle occasionally accompanies interrogations. Cf 188 A123 K61 A838 γ22 πῶς τ' ἄρ' ο509 N307 πῇ (probably ποῖ) τ' ἄρ (so Bekker, γὰρ Mss) A8 τίς τ' ἄρ κ501 τίς τ' ἄρ (so Cobet, Mss γάρ) Mss τίπτε. Analogous metrical contrivances are πτόλις πτόλεμος, see note on ν 64

Θέτι τανύπεπλε, ἱκάνεις Zenodotos with the idea of correcting the rhythm and the hiatus wrote Θέτις τανύπεπλος both here and at ν 424, an unnecessary alteration

386 αἰδοίη Mss αἰδοίη, as also in νν 394 and 425. The contraction is not homeric

387 ξείνια Although ξείνος and its derivatives occur in considerable numbers, still there are eight passages where we find derivatives from ξείνος without the rhythm permitting a long penultimate. This makes me suspect that ξείνια is the genuine form as found in Attic, ξείνια being a metrical expedient, such as that of the examples arrayed in note on ν. 485

Θέω Mss θεῶω In the subjunctives of athematic aorists the suf-

Ὡς δ' αὖ φωνήσασα πρόσω ρ' ἄγε δία θεῶων
 Τὴν μὲν ἔπειτα κάθισεν ἐπὶ θρόνου ἀργυροῦλου
 καλοῦ δαιδαλέου, ὑπὸ δὲ θρήνης ποσὶν ἦεν, 390
 κέκλετο δ' Ἡφαιστον κλυτοτέχνην ῥέπε τε μῦθον·
 Ἡφαιστε, πρόμολ' ὦκα· θέτις νύ τι σέο χατίζει
 Τὴν δ' ἡμείβετ' ἔπειτα περικλυτὸς ἀμφιγυνοῖς
 Ἥ ῥά νύ μοι δρεινὴ τε καὶ αἰδοίη θεὸς ἔνδον,
 ἥ μ' ἐσάωσ' ὅτε μ' ἄλγος ἀφίκετο τῆλε πεσόντα 395
 μητρὸς ἐμῆς ἰότητι κυνώπιδος, ἥ μ' ἐθέλησε
 κρύψαι χολὸν ἐόνθ'· ὅτε κεν πάθον ἄλγεα θυμῷ
 εἰ μὴ μ' Ἐρινόμη τε θέτις θ' ὑπεδέξατο κόλπῳ,
 Ἐρινόμη θυγάτηρ Ἀψορρόου Ὀκεανοῖο

fixes -έη etc were often altered for metrical purposes into -είη etc (cf
 378 *μυγείης* but B475 *μυγέωσιν*) in imitation of the optatives in -είη
 etc. In this way were created forms like *κιχείω* *δαείω* *δαμείη*. The
 root being *θε-*, there is no reason for *θείω*, nor *φοί θήω*, or *θήομεν*
 (read *θέομεν*) of A143, which apparently are an invention of Curtius.
 In Z113 ὄφρ' ἂν (Aristarchos ὄφρα κ') ἐγὼ βείω the right reading
 must be ὄφρα κε βείω ἐγώ.

388. πρόσω ρ' ἄγε So vLeeuwen Mss πρόσω ἄγε

389 τὴν μὲν ἔπειτα κάθισεν Mss καθίσεν, and similarly in E36
 and 8524. But the active *to seat* is *καθίζω*, cf Z360 μὴ με κάθιζε
 T280 κάθισαν δὲ γυναῖκας. The formation *καθίσεν* I do not under-
 stand. In 203 ὅτε τε (read ὁπότε) Κρόνον εὐρύνοπα(?) Ζεὺς γαίης νέρθε
καθεῖσε the right reading must be *καθῆκε*, *precipitated*. Cf Soph Tr
 273 ἀπ' ἄκρας ἦκε πλακός.

θρόνου ἀργυροῦλου Qu ἀργυροπέζου.

391 ῥέπε Mss εἶπε See note on v 94

392. πρόμολ' ὦκα Mss ὦδε in a local sense against homeric usage.
 Aristarchos, in his preoccupation—fortunately for us—not to touch
 the traditional reading, thought of expounding it as οἷτως ὡς ἔχεις,
 οὐδὲν ὑπερθέμενος. In vain.

395 ὅτε μ' ἄλγος ἀφίκετο τῆλε πεσόντα. Probably ὅτε μ(οι) ἄλγος ἐφίκετο τῆλε πεσόντα, the preposition having the same force as in A 445 Ἀργείοισι κήδε' ἐφῆκε. In the same way in I 525 ὅτε κέν τιν' ἐπιζάφελος χόλος ἴκοι the proper lection probably is ὅτ' ἐπὶ τιν(ι) ἐπιζάφελος χόλος ἴκοι, 1 e ἐπὶ-ἴκοι = ἐφίκοι. See note on v 431.

397 ἰόνθ' ὅτε κεν πάθον. Mss ἰόντα τότ' ἂν πάθον, where ἂν is not homeric.

398 Ἐρινόμη. There are several words, notably proper names, beginning with εὔρυ-, where its force not being rationally explicable εὔρυ- ought to be replaced by the intensive adverb ἐρι-, such I am confident is the Mss Εὐρυνόμη. Cf Soph Aj 569 Ἐριβοία. The disfigurement, suggested by such words as εὔρυνάγεια, was made for metrical purposes. Other instances are εὔρύροπα, which by analogy with ἐριβρεμέτης and ἐρίδουπος should be ἐρίροπα, and Εὐρύκλεια, which by analogy with ἐρικυδής should be Ἐρίκλεια. Compare also the clear case of Εὐρυσθεὺς = Εὐρυσθενής (see note on v 47) with ἐρισθενής. I believe that the same intensive ἐρι- couches under Ἐρευθαλίω, cf ἐριθαλές (Mss ἐριθηλές) and ἐριφυνές (Mss εὔρυφυνές).

Ἐρινόμη τε Θέτις θ' ὑπεδέξατο. Cf Thuc 7-37 οἱ τε ὀπλῖται καὶ οἱ ἱππῆς καὶ ἡ γυμνητεία προσήει. 7-43 αὐτὸς καὶ Εὐρυμέδων καὶ Μένανδρος ἀναλαβὼν τὴν στρατιὰν ἐχώρει. Shak Macb 1-3-147 *time and the hour runs*, see Abbott §336.

κόλπῳ. Probably a metrical expedient for μυχῶ, to which supply δόμου (X 440) or θαλάμου (π 285) or ἄντρον (ι 236). So the Oceanids, of whom Θέτις was one, refer in Aesch Prom 138 to their habitation as ἄντρον μυχόν. A similar expedient in κ 235 σίτῳ for ποτῶ.

399 ἀψορρόου ὤκεανόιο. The adjective commonly explained in accordance with the Scholiast 'τοῦ κύκλῳ περινοστούντος τὴν γῆν καὶ ἀψ πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ αὐτὰ ἀφικνουμένου'. A fanciful explanation. Probably αἰψηρρόου as a syncopated form of αἰψηρορόου (see note on v 47). Cf. Hesiod Theog 379 βορέην αἰψηροκέλευθον.

ἀψορρόου. I doubt whether ρ is ever doubled. Cf A 361 κατέρεξε. Commenting upon ἄρραξεν the Scholiast at Theoc 2-6 says 'ἀράσσω δι' ἐνὸς ρ, οἱ ποιηταὶ δ' ὅτε ἔχονσι χρείαν ἐκτείνειν τὸ α, καὶ ἕτερον ρ προστι-

- Τῇσι πάρ' ἐνάρετες χάλκεον δαίδαλα πολλὰ, 400
 πόρπας γναμπτάς τε ρέλικας κάλυκας τε καὶ ὄρμους,
 ἐν σπέει γλαφυρῶ, περὶ δὲ ῥόος Ὀκεανοῖο
 ἀφρῶ μορμύρων ῥέεν ἀσπετος Οὐδέ τις ἄλλος
 ροῖδεεν οὔτε θεῶν οὔτε θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων,
 ἀλλὰ Θέτις τε καὶ Ἐρινόμη ρίσαν, αἷ με σάωσαν 405
 * Ἡ νῦν ἡμέτερον δόμον ἵκει τῷ με μάλα χρὴ
 πάντα Θέτιδι ἐνπλοκάμῳ ζῳάγρια τίνειν.
 Ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν νῦν ροι παράθες ξένι' ἑῶα καλά,
 τόφρα δ' ἐγὼ φύσας ἀποθήσομαι ὄπλα τε πάντα.
 Ἡ καὶ ἀπ' ἀκμοθέτεο πελδριον ἄκμον' ἀνίστη. 410

θέασιν' But it is not poets like Homer who would thus disfigure the language, but rhapsodists or grammarians or unresourceful poetasters Aristarchos admitted the non-duplication of liquids

400 ἐνάρετες Mss εἰνάετες Further in accordance with ἐνῆα and ἐνενηκόντα it seems probable that the word was really ἐνέρετες.

χάλκεον This is supposed to be a violation of Wernicke's law, which disallows at the fourth foot a spondee the second syllable of which is long by position So much the worse for the law, for the verse is perfect

401 πόρπας γναμπτάς τε ρέλικας Mss πόρπας τε γναμπτάς θ' ἑλικας But ἑλικας coming from ρελίσσω must begin with a digamma To the correct reading leads the variant of τε being omitted after πόρπας

402 σπέει So Payne Knight Mss σπῆι

403 ῥέεν I have a note that Liddell has proposed θέεν, but I cannot trace the place where he has done so. Certainly ῥόος-ῥέεν does not sound very resourceful Either θέεν or τρέχεν would be fitly elegant

404 ροῖδεεν So Payne Knight in accordance with ροῖδα Mss ῥδεεν, which being digammated introduces an augment within the root, how can that be?

405. *ῥίσαν* The only instance in the *Iliad* of this imperfect plural. It recurs thrice in the *Odyssey* (8772 v170 ψ152) in τὰ δ' οὐκ ἴσαν ὡς ἐτέτυκτο, an incomprehensible phrase, which probably once read τὰ δ' αὐτ' (one Ms at 8772 οὐτ') ἴσαν ὡς πέπρωτο, but *these matters proceeded as preordained*, which probably suggested Aesch Ag 68 τελείται δ' εἰς τὸ πεπρωμένον

406. *χρή* So some documents and Payne Knight. Commonly *χρεών* with a non-homeric synizesis

407. *Θέτιδι ευπλοκάμῳ* Most Mss *Θέτι*, an impossible dative, but *Θέτιδι* stands in Yb and in the excellent Ub, and necessitates *ευπλοκάμῳ* as emended by Brandreth (*ευπλοκαμῳ Θετιδι*) in the place of the Mss *καλλιπλοκάμῳ* For the hiatus cf ε287 ἀμφ' Ὀδυσσεὶ ἐμέο, etc The disfigurement must have arisen from the usual aversion to tribrachs.

408. *ξένη' ἑέα καλὰ* Mss *ξενῆα καλὰ*, but the word is *ξείνια*, or rather, as I said in note on v 387, *ξένια* The corruption due to a desire to avoid the tribrach at the fifth foot The plural of *ἐς* seems occasionally to have perplexed the ancient rhapsodists or grammarians as shown by Ω528 *ἑάων*, which of course was *ἑέων*, 1 e *ἀγαθῶν* There is no tautology in *ἑέα καλὰ*

409. *τόφρα δ' ἐγὼ φύσας ἀποθήσομαι* For *τόφρα* without a previous *ὄφρα* cf 338 Ω525 and often Mss *ὄφρ' ἂν ἐγὼ ἀποθείομαι*, where *ἀποθείομαι* and *ἂν* are not homeric Nor is *ἀποθήσομαι* as some editors write, that, as explained in note on v 387, would be *ἀποθέωμαι*

410. *ἀκμοθέτεο* A genitive of *ἀκμοθέτης*, with which compare *ἀποθέτης* Mss *ἀκμοθέτω* for metrical purposes, for *ἀκμόθετος* or *ἀκμόθετον* would be an adjective The same error in v 476 θ274.

πελόριον ἄκμον' ἀνίστη *Lifted off the ponderous anvil* from the block in order to place it tidily in its proper place when out of work, as Hephaistos does with all his other implements, afterwards, as we are informed at v 476, he replaces it on the block Mss *πέλωρ αἴητον ἀνίστη*, devoid of all meaning, and *ἀνίστη* represents Hephaistos as if he had been sitting on the block Do blacksmiths sit down when

- χαλεύων, ὑπὸ δὲ κνήμαι ῥώνοντο ραραϊαί
 Φύσας δ' ἄρ' ἀπάνευθε τίθη πυρὸς, ὅπλα τε πάντα
 λάρνακ' ἐς ἀργυρέην συλλέξατο τοῖς' ἐπένετο.
 Σπόγγῳ δ' ἀμφὶ πρόσωπα καὶ ἄμφω χεῖρ' ἀπομόργνυ
 αὐχένα τε στιβαρὸν καὶ στήθεα λαχνήεντα· 415
 δῦ δὲ χιτῶνα, ἔλε δὲ σκῆπτρον παχὺ, βῆ δὲ θύραζε,
 χαλεύων, ὑπὸ δ' ἀμφίπολοι ῥώνοντο ῥάνακτι
 χρύσειαι, ζῶησι νεήνισι ρεβοικυῖαι
 Τῆς ἐν μὲν νόος ἐστὶ μετὰ φρεσὶν, ἐν δὲ καὶ αὐδὴ
 καὶ σθένος, ἀθανάτων δὲ θεῶν ἀπο ῥέργα ῥίσασιν 420
 Αἱ μὲν ὑπαιθα ῥάνακτος ἐποίπνουν, αὐτὰρ ὁ ῥέρρων
 τῇ δ' ἵκεν ἔνθα Θέτις περ ἐπὶ θρόνου Ἰζε φαεινοῦ,
 ἐν τ' ἄρα ροὶ φῦ χειρὶ ῥέπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε
 Τί τε, Θέτι ταυύπεπλε, ἰκάνεις ἡμέτερον δῶ,
 αἰδοῖτῃ τε φίλῃ τε, Πάρος γε μὲν οὔ τι θαμίζεις 425
 Αὐδὰ' ὅ τι φρονέεις, τελέσαι δέ με θυμὸς ἀνώγει
 εἰ δύναμαι τελέσαι γε καὶ εἰ τετελεσμένον ἐστί
 Τὸν δ' ἡμείβετ' ἔπειτα Θέτις κατὰ δάκρυ χέουσα
 "Ἡφαιστε, ἦ ἄρα δὴ τις, ὅσοι θεοὶ εἴς' ἐν 'Ολύμπῳ,
 τοσάδ' ἐνὶ φρεσὶ ρῆσιν ἀνέσχετο κήδεα λυγρὰ, 430

at work? The strange word αἴητον has been approached to αἴητον of Φ395, which is equally incomprehensible and, I think, a misreading of ἀαπτον

411 An absurd verse concocted by the interpolator, who for purposes of wonderment added also vv 417 ff If according to E425 ἀραιὸς means *tender*, it is incompatible with ῥώνοντο which suggests an active movement, nor does ῥώνοντο consort with χαλεύων.

412 δ' ἄρ' *Afterwards* Μεσ μὲν ῥ' as if Hephaistos in tidying up his tools began with the bellows, whereas the first thing he did was to lay aside his anvil The change made by the interpolator who added v 411

413 ἐπένετο Mss ἐπονείτο See note on v 380.

414. ἀμφὶ πρόσωπα I do not think it possible that a short syllable before προ- can remain such. Perhaps μέτωπα, which plural is found at ζ107 See note on v 24

417 to 421 Spurious, see note on vv 375 ff The verb ποιπνύω in the sense of *to walk*, whereas it means *to busy oneself*, suffices to give away the forger

419 ἐν δὲ καὶ αὐδὴ καὶ σθένος Perhaps here the interpolator was done an injustice by an amanuensis, for I suspect that he wrote ἐν δὲ καὶ αὐδὴ στήθεσιν, cf Δ430 ἔχοντ' ἐν στήθεσιν αὐδὴν

422 τῇ δ' ἵκεν (or ἵεν) ἔνθα Θέτις περ ἐπὶ θρόνου ἴξε φαινοῦ And he came (or went) there where Thetis was seated upon a resplendent chair. Cf. Υ319 βῆ ῥ' ἵμεν ἀνὰ κλόνον (so v 416 βῆ δὲ θύραζε), ἴξε δ' ὅθ' Αἰνείης ἦεν θ362 ἵκανε φιλομειδὴς Ἀφροδίτη εἰς Πάφον, ἔνθα τέ ροι τέμενος Mss πλησίον, ἔνθα Θέτις περ, (so commonly punctuated) ἐπὶ θρόνου ἴξε φαινοῦ But when the spurious vv 417 to 421 are eliminated, we are left with βῆ δὲ θύραζε πλησίον, which is an extremely awkward construction Commentators, who have not suspected the spuriousness of those verses nor the corruptness of πλησίον, are reduced to making Hephaistos sit down—whereas according to v 389 it is Thetis who sits—besides making him sit down first and then salute his visitor, which is not Homei's (or anybody else's) way, as neither is the artificial verbless ἔνθα Θέτις περ

περ I doubt its correctness Perhaps παρ' to be taken with ἴξε, 1 ο παριῶζε (Χάριτι)

ἴξε This also seems to me wrong, for I suspect that ἴζω is always active Perhaps ἦστο

424 τί τε Mss τίπτε See note on v 385

426 αὔδα' So Payne Knight Mss αὔδα with a non-homeric contraction

427 An unsuitable verse, and omitted in three Mss and a papyrus Payne Knight 'a Ξ196 malè repetitus'

429 ἡ ἄρα δὴ τις, ὅσοι θεοί Cf I55 οὗ τις, ὅσοι Ἀχαιοί

ὅσοι θεοί Mss ὅσαι θεαί See next note

δσ'έμοι ἐκ πάντων Κρονίδης Ζεὺς ἀλγε' ἔδωκεν,
 Ἐκ μὲν μ' ἀλλάων ἀλιάων ἀνδρὶ δάμασεν,
 Αἰακίδῃ Πηλεί, καὶ ἔτλην ἀνέρος εὐνήν,
 πολλὰ μάλ' οὐκ ἐθέλουσα Ὅ μὲν δὴ γῆραι λυγρῷ
 ἦσται ἐνὶ μεγάροισι μεμαρμένος, ἀλλὰ δέ μοι νῦν 435
 Ἐπεί μοι δῶκε γενέσθαι τε τραφέμεν τε,
 ἔξοχον ἡρώων, ὃ δ' ἀνέδραμεν ἔρνει ρίσος,
 τῆν μὲν ἐγὼ θρέψασα φυτὸν ὥς γονῶ ἀλωῆς,
 νηυσὶν ἐπὶ προέηκα κορωνίσι Φίλιον εἴσω
 Τρωσὶ μαχασόμενον, τὸν δ' οὐχ ὑποδέξομαι αὐτὶς 440
 ρούκαδε νοστήσαντα δόμον Πηλείων εἴσω
 Ὅφρα δέ μοι ζῶει καὶ ὄρᾳ φάος ἀελίοιο,
 ἀχνυται, οὐδέ τί μοι δύναμαι χραισμῆσαι ἰούσα
 Κούρην γὰρ ἦν μοι γέρας ἔξελον υἱοὶ Ἀχαιῶν
 τὴν ἄψ ἐκ χειρῶν ἔλετο κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων 445

431. ἐκ πάντων So in A516 Thetis complains of being treated as if she were inferior not to the other goddesses alone, but generally to all the gods, saying ὅσον ἐγὼ μετὰ πᾶσιν ἀτιμοτάτῃ θεὸς εἰμι Mss ἐκ πασέων, which is an impossible genitive Blaydes at Soph Elec. 771 'A woman often speaks of herself in the plural in the masculine gender. Cf on 399, Tr 151 '

ἀλγε' ἔδωκεν Cf A96 ἀλγε' ἔδωκε ρεκηβόλος ἡδ' ἔτι δώσει Some Mss ἔθηκεν, as in A2 ἀλγε' ἔθηκε, where, however, probably ἐφῆκε See note on v 395

434 γῆραι λυγρῷ ἦσται ἐνὶ μεγάροισι μεμαρμένος. Cf ω390 κατὰ γῆρας ἔμαρψε. Hes Sc 245 οἱ πρεσβῆες (?) ἔσαν γῆράς τε μέμαρπεν (Mss μέμαρπον), 1 e. οὗς τε γῆρας μέμαρπεν Similarly Ψ62 τὸν ὕπνος ἔμαρπτε Mss μεγάρους ἀρημένος, where ἀρημένος is meaningless In ζ2 ὕπνω ἀρημένος the same correction needed In σ53 and 81 for δύη ἀρημένον read δυηφι (or δύησι) μεμαρμένον

435. ἦσται Mss κείται But Peleus was not dead See note on v 178 Cf. A415 αἶθ' ὄφελος ἀπήμων ἦσθαι

436 ὅον Mss ὅον See notes on vv 31 and 76

438 to 442 Respecting the readings γονῶ-γηνσὶν-ἐπι-μαχεσόμενον-Πηλείον-δῶ-ἀελίοιο see notes on the parallel vv. 57 to 61.

440 τὸν δ' οὐχ ὑποδέξομαι Probably with an antithetical tone νῦν δ' οὐ ρ' ὑποδέξομαι, cf A415 αἰθ' ὄφελος ἀπήμων ἦσθαι, νῦν δ' ὠκύμορος ἔπλεο. This remark applies also to v. 59

444 to 456 συνήγαγέ τις τὰ διὰ πολλῶν εἰρημένα εἰς ἓνα τόπον, ὡς ἐκείνα 'ψόχόμεθ' ἐς Θῆβην ἱερὴν πόλιν [A366]' Διὰ δὲ τῶν ἐξῆς [457] ἐπιδείκνυσιν ὅτι τε ὁ Πάτροκλος τελευτήσας ἀπώλεσε τὰ ὄπλα καὶ πάρεστιν ἕτερα ληψομένη Διὰ μέντοι τούτων οὐδὲν ἀναγκαῖον λέγεται Καὶ ψεῖδος περιέχουσιν, οὐ γὰρ ταῖς λιταῖς πεισθεῖς Ὀδυσσεὺς καὶ Αἴαντος ἐξέπεμψε τὸν Πάτροκλον, ἀλλ' ὕστερον ἐκουσίως ὁ Πάτροκλος, κατελέσας τὴν φθορὰν τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ἐκέλευσε δοθῆναι αὐτῷ τοῦ Ἀχιλλεύς τὰ ὄπλα ARISTARCHOS This is a weighty comment, and to it may be added (1) that ἐεῖλεον is wrong for ἔελλον, 1 e ἔρ'ελλον, and (2) that the statement πᾶν δ' ἡμαρ μάρναντο περὶ Σκαιῆσι πύλῃσι is inaccurate On the other hand, we can hardly dispense with these verses, for it is more consonant with life that Thetis should not abruptly come to her request, but expatiate to some extent upon the events which culminated in the loss of her son's panoply. However, it is questionable whether we possess the passage in its original form, to me it looks like a recast

444 κούρην γὰρ ἦν The force of γὰρ is explanatory, as it is in v 288, where see note With the object of eliminating the iamb the original reading was altered to κούρην ἦν ἄρα with its two blemishes (1) the asyndeton in passing to a flesh idea, which is not Homer's way, and (2) the meaningless ἄρα The same correction required in the parallel passage II56

ἰοί Mss υἱες See note on v 76.

445 κρείων That this is fictitious is proved by Κρέων and Κρέονσα I suggest ἐρικάων, a compound from ἐρι- (see note on v 398) and καίνυμαι Its second constituent is the same as the proper name Κάων, which in our Mss appears as Κόων owing to the constant disfigurement of the suffix -άων into -όων The root κα- (an alternative root to καθ-) is preserved in Νηυσικήη (Mss Ναυσικάη)

*Ἦτοι ὁ τῆς ἀχέων φρένας ἔσθιεν, ἀτὰρ Ἀχαιοὺς
 Τρῶες ἐπὶ πρυμνήσιν ἐρέϊλεον, οὐδὲ θύραζε
 ἔαον ἐξίναί. Τὸν δὲ ρλίσσαντο γέροντες
 Ἀργεῖων, καὶ πολλὰ περικλυτὰ δῶρ' ὀνόμαζον
 *Εὐθ' αὐτὸς μὲν ἔπειτ' ἠγναίνετο λοιγὸν ἀμύναι, 450
 ἀτὰρ ὁ Πάτροκλον περὶ μὲν ἐβᾶ τεύχε' ἔρεσε,
 πέμπε δέ μιν πολεμόνδε, πολὺν δ' ἅμα ρ' ὥπασε λαόν
 Πᾶν δ' ἡμαρ μάρναντο περὶ Σκαιῆσι πύλῃσι,
 καὶ νῦ κεν αὐτῆμαρ πόλιν ἔπραθον εἰ μὴ Ἀπόλλων
 πολλὰ κακὰ βέξαντα Μενοτίου ἄλκιμον υἱὸν 455
 ἔκταν' ἐνὶ προμάχοισι καὶ Ἔκτορι κῦδος ἔδωκε
 Τούνεκα νῦν τεὰ γόναθ' ἰκάνομαι, αἱ κ' ἐθέλῃσθα
 υἱεῖ ἐμῷ ὠκυμόρῳ δόμεν ἀσπίδα καὶ τρυφάλειαν
 καὶ καλὰς κνημίδας ἐπισφυρίοισ' ἀραρύας
 καὶ θώρηχ', ἐβᾶ γάρ ροι ἀπώλεσε πιστὸς ἐταῖρος 460
 Τρωσὶ δαμείς ὁ δὲ κείται ἐπὶ χθονὶ θυμὸν ἀχέων.

446 ἔσθιεν So Blass Mss ἔφθιεν, a solecism.

ἀτὰρ Mss αὐτὰρ, as also in v. 451 See note on v. 148

447 πρυμνήσιν See note on v. 76

448. ἔαον Mss εἴων See note on v. 189.

ἐξίναί. Mss ἐξιέναι See note on v. 14

451 ἐβᾶ So Payne Knight Mss τὰ ᾤ

ἔρεσε Mss ἔσσε See note on v. 36

452 πολὺν δ' ἅμα ρ[οι] ὥπασε λαόν Mss πολὺν δ' ἅμα λαὸν ὥπασσε
 One Ms, however, gives δέ οἱ instead of ἅμα, which has suggested
 to v. Leeuwen πολὺν δέ ροι ὥπασσε λαόν in accordance with 1483 πολὺν
 δέ μοι (δέ μ' ᾄμ' ?) ὥπασσε λαόν.

455 Μενοτίου Mss Μενοιτίου Whether the first part of this com-
 pound be from μένος or μένω, there is no occasion for the insertion
 of the iota It is only a sign that the second syllable is rhythmically
 long ; see note on v. 531 Eustathios 'Μενοίτιος πλεονασμὸν ἔχει τοῦ
 ἰῶτα ὡς ἐκ τοῦ μένος' It is the derivation from μένω which is more

likely; that from μένος would have given Μένειος, cf. Μενέλαος, Μενεσθεύς. See note on v 93.

457. τοῦνεκα. A non-homeric contraction. Perhaps τὸ καί, see note on v 247.

τέα. So Payne Knight. The Mss τὰ σά

γόναθ' ἰκάνομαι. Repeated in γ92 and δ322. In my note at X24 I remarked 'The lengthening in the antepenultimate of the traditional form γούνατα is supposed to compensate for the loss of a digamma, this digamma existing as ν in the nominative γόνν. The distinction between this ν and those in the suffixes of ράστυ πῶν μέθυ seems to me arbitrary. I have no doubt myself that γούνατα is a rhythmical expedient and was created after γούνα. In the latter word the lengthening is easily accounted for: a syllable having been lost, the word strove to regain its previous quantity by lengthening another syllable. Cf. δόμεναι-δοῖναι ἔμεναι-εῖναι.' See note on v 14. Perhaps γοῦν' ἀφικάνομαι, if the form ἰκάνομαι for ἰκάνω be correct, for it recurs only in two other stock phrases: (1) χρεῖώ γάρ ἰκάνεται in K118 and Λ610, and (2) ψ7 27 ἦλθ' Ὀδυσσεὺς καὶ ροῖκον ἰκάνεται, ψ36 εἰ ἔτεδ' οὖν ροῖκον ἰκάνεται, ψ108 ἔστ' Ὀδυσσεὺς καὶ ροῖκον ἰκάνεται. Therefore I should prefer γόναθ' ἀφικνέομαι.

458. υἱεῖ ἐμῷ. Mss fluctuate between υἱεῖ υἱεῖ υἱεῖ and υἱ', none of which is admissible, see notes on vv 76 and 200. Possibly υἱεῖ μ(οι), cf. β50 μητέρι μοι μνηστήρες ἐπέχραον (where the tone of affection is weakened by the conjecture μητέρ' ἐμῇ).

459. καὶ καλὰς κνημίδας. Perhaps καλὰς τε κνημίδας.

κνημίδας. Commonly κνημίδας. Cf. ἀσπίδα αἰγίδα.

ἀραρυίας. Mss ἀραρυίας for metrical purposes.

460. καὶ θώρηχ', ἐφ' ᾧ γάρ σοι (an ethic dative) ἀπώλεσε. Mss καὶ θώρηχ', ᾧ (most Mss δ) γάρ ἦν οἱ ἀπώλεσε, with a double blemish, for ἦν is not homeric, and οἱ, as Leaf remarks, should precede the verb.

461. κεῖται. It should be ἦσται. See note on v 435.

θυμὸν ἀχέων. Mss ἀχεύων, which is inexplicable as a derivative from ἄχος. It is pseudo-metrical (see note on v 24). As it always is located at the ends of verses, it allows of its being replaced by

Τὴν δ' ἡμίβετ' ἔπειτα περικλυτὸς ἀμφιγυόεις
 Θάρσσε, μή τοι ταῦτα, Θέτι, φρεσὶ σῇσι μελόντων
 Αἰ γάρ μιν θανάτοιο δυσηχέος ὧδε δυνάϊμην
 νόσφιν ὑπὲκ ρεῦσαι ὅτε μιν μόρος αἰνὸς ἱκάνοι,
 ὥς ροὶ τεύχεα καλὰ παρέσεται, οἷά τις ἄντα
 ἀνδρῶν ἔκπαγλον θαυμάσεται ὅς κε ρίδῃται
 ὧς φάμενος τὴν μὲν λίπεν αὐτοῦ, βῆ δ' ἐπὶ φύσας.
 Τὰς δ' ἐς πῦρ ἔστρεψε, κέλευσε δὲ ρεργάζεσθαι
 Φῦσαι δ' ἐν χοάνουσιν εἰκοσι πᾶσαι ἐφύσων,
 παντοίην εὐπρηστον ἀντμὴν ἐξανιέσαι,
 ἄλλοτε μὲν σπεύδοντι παρέμμεναι, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε,

ἀχέων. On the other hand, cf E399 κῆρ ἀχέων, where ἀχέων is not admissible, nor is it in B694 724 I567 λ195 ο361 However, I doubt the genuineness of this verse

462 ἀμφιγυόεις Mss ἀμφιγυήεις See note on v 383

463 θάρσσει So Payne Knight Mss θάρσει.

μή τοι ταῦτα, Θέτι, φρεσὶ σῇσι μελόντων Cf Ω152 μηδέ τί ροὶ θάνατος μελίτω φρεσὶ Mss μετὰ φρεσὶ, to which Nauck has objected, proposing in its stead ἐν φρεσὶ

μελόντων Qi μελίτω

464 δυσηχέος Probably an error, for as I have pointed out in my comment on X180, the adjective δυσηχης is applicable say to war, where noise and clamour (ῥηχὴ) are prevalent The application of ῥηχὴ to lamentations over the dead by the Tragedians is artificial (see note on v. 495), no instances of such a usage are found in Homer

465 νόσφιν I doubt its correctness, it seems otiose if ὑπὲκ (see next note) be right

ὑπὲκ ρεῦσαι. Cf 232 ὑπὲκ βελέων ρεῦσαντες Mss ἀποκρῦσαι Such a phrase as θανάτοιο νόσφιν ἀποκρῦσαι is unparalleled, and the attempts made so far to justify it seem to me fantastic

466 παρέσεται So in a Viennese document at A213 Mss παρῑσεται Aristophanes and Zenodotos wrote παρέξομαι

ἄντα. To be construed with *ρίδεται* of the following verse. Cf. T15 ἄντην εἰσριδέμεν (τεύχεα, as here) Ω223 εἰσέδρακον ἄντην. λ143 ἐς ἄντα ριδεῖν Callim Hecale, Col 1 ἐπέτρεσαν θῆρα ἀντίον ιδέσθαι Mss αἶτε without any apparent force.

467. ἀνδρῶν ἔκπαγλον θαυμάσεται Mss ἀνθρώπων πολέων I doubt πολέων as a truly homeric form instead of πολλῶν, and in any case its business here is none too clear The correction to ἔκπαγλον carries with it the replacement of ἀνθρώπων by ἀνδρῶν, which in fact is far more appropriate, considering that the persons who would admire the arms would be warriors, ἄνδρες, and not ordinary men, ἄνθρωποι

θαυμάσεται Mss θανμάσεται See note on v 36

468 φάμενος Mss εἰπών See note on v 202

469 ἔστρεψε So Ub and other witnesses *Turned round* The variant ἔτρεψε, commonly adopted, is unsuitable, meaning *turned back or down* Mss often fluctuate between τρέπω and στρέφω, as for instance in Φ603

κέλευσε δὲ (so a papyrus and many other documents, commonly the variant τε is preferred) *ῥεργάζεσθαι* Hephaistos affectionately addresses his bellows as if they were intelligent beings, as I dare say workmen sometimes do It is, I surmise, this κέλευσε which suggested the idea of endowing tripods with life and creating live golden ἀμφίπολοι

470 to 473 These verses appear to me to be a continuation of the wonders interpolated For ἐφύσων εἵρηστον ἄντο are wrong for ἐφύσαον ἐπρηστον ἀνύοιτο, nor does παρέμμεναι afford any rational meaning Besides, the idea of the whole passage must have been that Hephaistos now blew a vigorous and anon a feeble blast, and this is not simply, i.e. homERICALLY, expressed

470 ἐφύσων Qu ἄεσαν

471 παντοῖην. HomERICALLY παντοίην

472 σπεύδοντι παρέμμεναι Qu σπεύδοντ' ἐπαρηγέμεν

αὔτε Qu οὐ τι.

ὅπως Ἡφαιστός τ' ἐθέλοι καὶ ρέργον αὐτο
 Χαλκὸν δ' ἄμ πυρὶ βάλεν ἀτειρέα κασσίτερόν τε
 καὶ χρυσὸν τιμήντα καὶ ἄργυρον· ἀτὰρ ἔπειτα 475
 θῆκεν ἐπ' ἀκμοθέτῃ μέγαν ἄκμονα, γέντο δὲ χειρὶ
 ραισθῆρα κρατερὴν, ἐτέρηφι δὲ γέντο πυράγῃην.

Ποίειε δὲ πρώτιστα σάκος μέγα τε στιβαρόν τε
 πάντοσε δαιδάλεον, περὶ δ' ἄντυγα βάλε φαεινὴν
 τρίπλακα μαρμαρίην, ἐκ δ' ἄργύρεον τελαμῶνα. 480
 Πέντε δὲ ταύρου ἔσαν σάκεος πτύχες, ἀτὰρ ἐν αὐτῷ
 ποίειε daídala πολλὰ ἰδυίησι πραπίδεσιν.

Ἐν μὲν γαίαν ἔτευξ', ἐν δ' οὐρανὸν, ἐν δὲ θάλασσαν,

473. ὅπως The true form would be ὅπως See note on v 115.

αὐτο. In support of this strange formation commentators refer to ε243 θεῶς δέ ρ' οἱ ἦντο ρέργον, but this is a corruption of the original θεῶς δέ ρ' ἀνέτο ρέργον, the object of which was to eliminate the προκελευσματικός Here the primitive word may have been ὄνατο, *would be profited*. A worthless variant ἀνοίτο

474. ἄμ πυρὶ βάλεν *He placed it over* (cf 177 πῆξαι ἀνὰ σκολόπεσι) *the fire*, naturally in the crucibles Mss ἐν πυρὶ, *in the fire* But ores are mixed with the fuel when they are being smelted, when the pure metal has to be cast and then fashioned, it is placed by itself in a crucible, and the crucible *over the fire* Homer is not likely to have blundered in this matter, for in describing life he reproduced what he actually saw—and the ancients saw at their own doors all the few crafts known in those times—and did not draw upon his imagination This is a method left to such poets as view and describe things from their armchairs For a similar error cf. M63 σκόλοπες ἐν αὐτῇ ἐστῶσι, where palpably the correct reading is ἀν' αὐτῇ, for the palisade was not fixed within the trench but up on its edge

βάλεν Cf 476 θῆκεν Mss βάλλον. See note on v. 76.

475 καὶ χρυσὸν τιμήντα A papyrus τιμήντα, which of course really is τιμήντα, and this must be the true form of this adjective. I should

propose χρυσὸν τιμῆντα καὶ ἄργυρον, an asyndeton with the preceding verse Nauck's χρυσὸν τ' αἰγλήντα is perfectly suitable in point of sense, but the change of αἰγλήντα to the solecistic τιμῆντα seems to me unaccountable.

476. ἐπ' ἀκμοθέτῃ *On the block* Why editors prefer the variant ἐν I do not understand

ἀκμοθέτῃ *Mss ἀκμοθέτω* See note on v 410.

γέντο A mysterious verb The derivations so far given are of the most fanciful kind

477 ραιστήρα πυράγην. Eustathios ἀφίησιν ἄψυχα 'That these tools are not endowed with life is a further proof that vv 375ff 411 417ff and 470ff are spurious

478. ποίειε So Payne Knight *Mss ποίει*

479 δαιδάλεον *Mss δαιδάλλον*, which as a derivative from δαίδαλος is an impossible form instead of δαιδαλόων The same correction needed at ψ200 A similar malformation is ἀτασθάλλω

480. μαρμαρίν *Glittering* *Mss μαρμαρήν* as if the baldrick were made of marble See note on v 25.

481 πέντε δὲ ταύρου ἔσαν σάκεος πτύχες *And the folds of the shield, made of bull's hide, were five* Shields made of such hide were considered to be of particularly fine quality So Ajax's famous σάκος was ἐπταβόειον ταύρων ζατρεφών (H222), and so is Hector's described in Π360, and Deiphobos's in N161 and 163 Cf further Ψ684 ἱμάντας βοός So in Kenya—and I daresay elsewhere—the native shields are made of cow-hides *Mss πέντε δ' ἄρ' αὐτοῦ* But it would be strange if, when the material of so many objects is recorded in extolling them, that of the shield were left out An additional indication of the corruption is ἄρ', here meaningless

483 to 608 Ζηνόδοτος ἠθέτηκεν ἀπὸ τούτου τοῦ στίχου τὰ λοιπὰ, ἀρκεσθεὶς τῇ κεφαλαιώδει προεκθέσει ARISTONIKOS Zenodotos's grounds must have been personal, because the Scholia do not add that these verses were absent from any copies He has been followed by some modern critics, who would thus deprive us of one of the loveliest pieces of poetry ever penned Such a picture as that of the fight before the city was popular among artists, as we see from old pottery,

ἀέλιόν τ' ἀκάμαντα σελήνην τε πλήθουσιν,
 ἐν δ' ἔτι τέραα πάντα τὰ τ' οὐρανῷ ἑσπεφάνωται, 485
 Πλειάδας θ' Ὑάδας τ' ἡδὲ σθένος Ὀαρίονος,
 Ἄρκτον θ' ἦν καὶ Ἀμαξαν ἐπὶ κλησὶν καλέουσι,
 ἥ τ' αὐτοῦ στρέφεται αἰεὶ τ' Ὀαρίονα δοκεύει,
 οἷη δ' ἄμορός ἐστι λοετρῶν Ὠκεανοῖο
 Ἐν δὲ δύο τεύξεν πόλιας μερόπων ἀνθρώπων 490

and it is unlikely that Homer would not himself have reproduced it, now that he had found an opening Leaf justly remarks that the linguistic evidence does not in any way bear out the theory of late origin

484 ἀέλιον Mss ἡέλιον See note on v. 61.

485 ἐν δ' ἔτι Mss ἐν δε τε (see note on v 106) or ἐν δὲ τὰ Neither lection is permissible

τέραα Παρὰ τὸ τερατώδη καὶ σημεῖα ταῦτα εἶναι SCHOLIA Mss τείρεα, but from τέρας the plural can only be τέραα Cf ο466 δέπα(α) The iota is the usual epenthetic sign (see note on v 76) which indicates that a short syllable is rhythmically long Such iotas exist in ἀκίω ἀλείατα (ἀλέω) ἀπειρέσια (ἐπαρέσια) ἀπείριτος (ἀπέρατος) ἀποπλείειν ἀποπνέουσα εἰαρινοῖσι εἶδατα (ἔδω) εἰλαρ (ἄλκαρ ?) εἰλιποδας (ἐρίποδας) εἰν εἵνατος εἵνεκα εἰρία εἰροκόμω εἰρόμεναι (Z239) ριоднеφὲς εἶρος (δ135, read ριоднеφὲ ἔρι) εἶρισαν (Λ9) θείειν θείη (M26, read θέη) θεμίλια καί εἰα κείν' ὄχα κρανείης κρείουσα κρειων μείλανι μείλινον νεΐαιρα νεικειω ξείνια οἶνοβαρεῖων ὀνείατα (read ὀνείατα, cf ὀνέημι) πείκω Πειραῖον πείρατα Πειρίθοος ἡνώγει πείρινθα (Ω190, read ἡνωγ' ὑπέρρινθα) πενήθίω πεπείρανται (μ37) πνεῖω βεία (βία) ῥεῖη σπείος στείος συφείος ὑμείων ὑπεῖρ ὑπεύροχος Ὑπευροχίδης φρεΐατα

οὐρανῷ ἑσπεφάνωται So Düntzer Cf A36 τῇ δ' ἔπι Γοργῷ ἑσπεφάνωτο, etc Mss οὐρανός

486 Πλειάδας So Payne Knight (πλεΐαδας) Mss Πληιάδας See note on v 2

Ὑάδας τ' ἡδὲ σθένος So Heyne Mss Ὑάδας τό τε σθένος with a non homeric article

Ῥαρίωνος See Boeckh at Pind. Nem 2.12. For the suffix -ονος, which I have adopted, see note on v 166. Mss Ῥαρίωνος with a faulty long iota, as in κυλλοποδίων of v 371. I further suspect that the primitive form was Ῥαρίων from ῥαρ, the *sword-armed*, which would better fit the conception of a hunter or warrior. So Apollo is called χρυσάωρος

488 αὐτοῦ στρέφεται Probably ἄντην, meaning that the bear turns round *facing* the hunter Cf ἄντην εἰσφιδέμεν in my note on v. 466 Eustathios 'δέδιεν ὡς ἄρκτος τὸν κυνηγέτην καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πρὸς τὸ τοῦ Ῥαρίωνος ἀπονέμει ἄστρον' Leaf says 'The idea seems to be that when Orion rises in the east, the Bear is on the horizon, which he then just touches in North Greece, he then moves upward, as though the coming of the great hunter had scared him from taking his bath'

αἰεὶ τ' Ῥαρίονα δοκεύει The bear steadily watches the hunter Mss καί τ' Ῥαρίονα with the frequent fault of two copulatives being joined.

δοκεύει Scholia 'εἰκότως αὐτὸν ἐπιτηρεῖ, ὅτι καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν κίνησιν αὐτῷ ποιεῖται ὥσπερ φησὶν Ἄρατος'

489 ἄμωρος So Payne Knight Cf ἀμαχητὶ ἀμώμητος Mss pseudometrically ἄμωρος See note on v 399

490 δύο τεύξεν πόλις Cf 483 ἔτευξε. Mss δύο ποίησε πόλεις, where neither the contracted accusative nor the form δύο are homeric The original text was tampered with in order to eliminate the iamb in the second foot

As a consequence of the grievously corrupt state of the text it has been imagined that of the two cities one was that in which the festival and the trial were taking place, and the other that round which the raid was planned But it is not so In the first city stood the festival by itself, whilst in and round the second there was depicted one connected episode, which represented that at the time when the citizens held a trial within and their attention was absorbed in its proceedings an attack was carried out by raiders intent upon plunder

Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Κοριαεὺς to some extent saw this, for the Scholia

Ἐν τῇ μὲν ἔρανοί τε γάμοι τ' ἔσαν εἰλαπίναι τε,
 νύμφας δ' ἐκ πέπλων δαΐδων ὕπο λαμπομενάων
 ἤγοντο κατὰ ράστνυ, πολὺς δ' ὑμέναιος ὁρώρει,

say that [Ἀλέξανδρος] 'ἀξιοὶ τὸ μὲν οἱ δ' οὕτω πείθοντο ἀκούειν περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει, τὸ δὲ λόγῳ δ' ὑπεθωρήσσοντο περὶ τῶν πολεμίων. Οἱ δὲ σκοποὶ τῶν πολεμίων εἰσὶ. Τὸ δὲ οἱ δ' ὥς οὖν ἐπύθοντο πολὺν κέλαδον παρὰ βουσὶν ἐπὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἀκούει ἐκαθέζοντο γὰρ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ βουλευόμενοι, ὅτε δ' αὐτοῖς ἐμηνύθη τὰ κατὰ τὰ ποιμένα, ἐπιτρέχουσι καὶ ἐξελλόντες συμβάλλουσι μάχην.' I had myself independently reached this conclusion before I realized the purport of this scholion. But all other ancient commentators were bewildered. Porphyrios wrote 'Πολλῆς ταραχῆς ἔδοξεν εἶναι τὰ ἐπὶ ταῦτα μέχρι τοῦ ἐν δ' ἐτίθει νεῖδν μαλακὴν. Ταράσσει γὰρ τοὺς πολλοὺς οἱ δύο στρατοὶ, ἄρα γε πολέμοι εἰσὶ τῶν κατοικούντων καὶ ἀλλήλοισι φίλοι, ἢ εἴ μὲν τῶν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, ὁ δ' ἕτερος πολέμιος, καὶ πρὸς τίνας διχονοοῦσιν, ἄρα γε πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἢ πρὸς τοὺς ἔνδον, καὶ ἐπὶ τίνων τὸ οἱ δ' οὕτω πείθοντο, ἄρα γε τῶν εἴσω ἢ τοῦ ἑτέρου στρατοῦ, καὶ πάλιν ἐπὶ τίνος τὸ λόγῳ δ' ὑπεθωρήσσοντο, ἄρα γε ὁ ἕτερος τῶν στρατῶν ἢ οἱ ἔνδον, καὶ τίνων οἱ σκοποὶ καὶ τίνων ἡ λεία, Πῶς τε, εἰ τῶν ἔνδον ἡ λεία, ὁ λόχος παρ' αὐτῶν, καὶ τίνες οἱ ἐπεξιόντες, ἄρα γε οἱ δύο στρατοὶ ἢ οἱ ἕτεροι, Ὅλως τε, τίς ἡ διατύπωσις τῆς πλάσεως,' In this bewilderment all modern expounders have joined.

491. ἐν τῇ μὲν ἔρανοί τε γάμοι τ' ἔσαν εἰλαπίναι τε Cf λ415 ἢ γάμῳ ἢ ἐράνῳ ἢ εἰλαπίνῃ α226 εἰλαπίνῃ ἢ γάμος, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἔρανος τάδε Mss καλὰς, ἐν τῇ μὲν ῥα γάμοι τ' ἔσαν εἰλαπίναι τε, where ἐν τῇ μὲν ῥα is an extremely unskilful combination, unworthy of a supreme poet who was able to write such a lovely account of a wedding. I think that ῥα, which has no force whatever, must represent a remnant of ἔρανοι, and that after this mutilation καλὰς, which we can forgo without the slightest detriment to the picture, was foisted in in order to complete the verse.

ἐν τῇ μὲν Perhaps ἐν μὲν τῇ

εἰλαπίναι. The derivation of this word so far remaining unraveled, I suggest tentatively ἐδόποτοι (ἔδω + πίνω), ἐδόποτος being perhaps the forbear of the modern φαγοπότι. Cf β305 φ69 ἐσθίμεν καὶ πινόμεν

492. ἐκ πέπλων. Otherwise ἐκ καλυμμάτων, *after* the ceremony of covering the bride with *the veil*. This ceremony was performed just prior to the bride's being conducted to her husband's home. See Wecklein at Eur IphT 372, who quotes Aesch.Ag 1178 χρησμός οὐκέτ' ἐκ καλυμμάτων ἴσται δεδορκώς νεογάμον νύμφης δίκην. Miss ἐκ θαλάμων, which unquestionably is a blunder, for it means *from the nuptial chamber*. That such is the meaning of θάλαμος Pollux makes clear in 3-37 by (1) ὁ τόπος τοῦ γάμον θάλαμος (= *the place where the marriage is consummated* is called θάλαμος), ὥσπερ ἵνα ἐτρέφετο παρθένων (= *as where the bride was being brought up* is called παρθένων) and (2) ὑπερον ἐξέδουν πρὸ τοῦ θαλάμου, ὥσπερ καὶ κόσκινον ἢ παῖς ἔφερεν (*the damsel brought from her home a sieve and received a pestle in front of the nuptial chamber*) Cf also A227 γήμας δ' ἐκ θαλάμοιο ἔκετο P36 χήρωςας δὲ γυναῖκα μυχῶ θαλάμοιο νέοιο Zenodotos sought out a remedy by conjecturing ἐς θαλάμους

ἐκ πέπλων = *after the veiling* Cf N493 πύομεν' ἐκ βοτάνης T290 κακὸν ἐκ κακοῦ Soph OT 282 δεῦτέρ' ἐκ τῶνδ' ἂν λέγοιμι. Thuc 1-120 ἐκ μὲν εἰρήνης πολεμεῖν, etc

δαίδων ὑπο λαμπομενάων In India, where in a very conservative spirit old Aryan customs seem to have been continued, the wedding procession takes place at night and is always preceded by a band. A very curious Aryan custom is that of one's chin being touched by a suitor in a fervent entreaty, as Zeus's is touched by Thetis in A501 and Achilles's by Priam in Ω506. I have also seen in India a kind of rhapsodist reciting at a fair whilst a crowd squatted round and listened absorbedly

493 ἤγοντο κατὰ ράστῃ. To this leads the imitative passage Hes Her 274 ἤγοντ' ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα, πολλὸς δ' ὕμέναιος ὀρώρει Cf also I146 ἀνάρεδνον (read ἀνέρεδνον) ἀγέσθω Callim.Dem.85 ἄγετό τις νύμφαν Bacchyl Dith 19 ἄγετο κόραν, etc. For κατὰ ράστῃ cf Z287 ἀόλλισσαν (ἀρῶλλισσαν?) κατὰ ράστῃ Ψ1 στενάχοντο κατὰ πόλιν, and often. Miss ἡγίνεον (with a non-homeric synizesis) ἀνὰ δστῃ. Fick's ἡγινον after ἀγινέμεναι of v213 is unsuitable in point of sense.

ὕμέναιος ὀρώρει. Qu. ὕμενάιος ὥρτο.

κοῦροι δ' ὀρχηστῆρες ἐδίνεον, ἐν δ' ἄμα τοῖσιν
 αὐλοὶ φόρμιγγές τ' ἐνοπὴν χέον· ἐν δὲ γυναῖκες 495
 ἰστάμεναι θαύμαζον ἐπὶ προθύροισι ρεκάσθη
 Ἐν δ' ἐτέρην ποιήσε πόλιν καλὴν εὐπυργον, *
 λαοὶ δ' ἐν ἀγορῇ ἔαθ' ἄθροοι Ἐνθα δὲ νεῖκος 497
 ὠρώρει, δύο δ' ἄνδρες ἐνείκεον ἕνεκα ποιinhς

494. ἐν δ' ἄμα τοῖσιν *And engraved in the shield together with these dancers. Mss give the usual intrusive meaningless ἄρα, which Clark arbitrarily, as it seems to me, interprets ut fieri solet. For ἐν cf 490 541 550.*

495. φόρμιγγές τ' ἐνοπὴν χέον. Cf K13 *συρίγγων τ' ἐνοπὴν*. Apoll Rhod 1-27 *ἀοιδῶν ἐνοπῇ* Mss φόρμιγγές τε βοὴν ἔχον But βοή is a warlike cry, especially in shouting for assistance For the usual phrase βοὴν ἀγαθός, in which βοή is employed in the sense of *loud voice*, read βίην ἀγαθός, a more appropriate attribute of a hero The Tragedians artificially apply βοή to any clamour, see note on v 464

χέον. This is Nauck's emendation, applied also at II105 The combination ἔχω ἐνοπὴν or βοὴν is unparalleled.

ἐν δὲ γυναῖκες Mss αἵ See note on v 494

496. ἰστάμεναι. I doubt its correctness, for ἰστάμενος everywhere seems to signify *standing*, or *standing near*, after a movement, whereas *standing inactively* or *idly*, as the context requires at this place, or *standing* in contradistinction to *sitting down*, is expressed by ἰσταῖς I therefore surmise that the original reading was ἰσταῖναι, and that an amanuensis or rhapsodist altered it because he was used to ἰστανῖναι, which here would be unrhythmical Cf. Ω394 ἰσταότες θαυμάζομεν, and similarly N11 *θανυμάζων ἦστο*

θαύμαζον. Lehrs ' *θανυμάζειν non tantum mirari significat, sed non-numquam i q θεᾶσθαι* ; B320 Ω394 Σ496, cf N11 ' On the other hand, θεᾶσθαι often means *θανυμάζω*, as comes out clearly in ω90 ἄλλᾳ

κε κῆνα μάλιστα ριδῶν ἐθέησατο (Mss θηήσατο wrongly, for the verb is θεάομαι) θυμῷ, with which 6459 θαύμαζεν δ' Ὀδυσσεύς ἐν (?) ὀφθαλμοῖς ὁράουσα may be compared. Cf. 813 θεάοντο (Mss θηέυντο) = θαύμαζον Scholia at ε76 'θηήσατο, ἰθαύμασεν.' Scholia Theocr. 1-56 (Ahrens) 'θάημα, ἥγον θαῦμα.' Hesych 'θηέιτο, ἰθαύμαζεν' Bacchyl Epin 10-14 παῖδα θαητόν 12-115 θαητόν αὖτον

497. Before this verse there once existed another, the form of which most probably was ἐν δ' ἐτέρῃν ποίησε πόλιν καλὴν (or μεγάλην) ἐύπυργον. Its traces one can surmise from (1) v 509 τὴν δ' ἐτέρῃν (2) καλὰς of v 490 and (3) εὐπυργος πόλις of the imitative description in Hesiod *Hei* 270 Considering that primitive people, once they have hit upon a popular work of art, reproduce it faithfully time after time (Gobineau in his *Histoire de Perse*, Vol 2, p 483 says *Les formes de l'art en Asie sont en quelque sorte éternelles*), Homer could not have failed to provide his besieged city with ramparts, a conspicuous detail depicted upon the well-known fragment of old pottery. A case in point is that of the δέπας ἀμφιπέλειον dealt with in the note on v 378. In India architectural features are constantly reproduced, at Pouri there is a great number of exquisite temples, and practically all, large and small, are identical in design.

ἐν So a papyrus. The rest of the documents εἰν. See on v 485

ἔαθ' Mss ἔσαν. But the correct reading is furnished by v 531 ἐδράων προπάρειθε καθήμενοι. Cf. also H414 οἱ δ' ἔατ' ἐν ἀγορῇ

498. According to the Scholia one of the litigants affirmed that he had paid the blood-money, and the other denied that he had received it. This cannot be correct, for if a payment had been made, there must have been numerous witnesses—in fact, the whole caste would have been present—and therefore the payment could not have been denied. The point was that the defendant pleaded for his release by payment, to which the prosecutor would not agree, insisting upon the more severe penalty of exile, such as was inflicted upon Θεοκλυμένος, who is said in ο224 to be φεύγων ἐξ Ἀργεος ἀνδρα κατακτάς. Cf. also H573 ἀνεψίων ἐξεναρίξας ἐς Πηλὸν ἰκέτευσε

ἐνεκα. Mss εἵνεκα. See note on v 485

ἀνδρὸς ἀποκταμένου ὁ μὲν ἦτέ' ἄποιν' ἀποδοῦναι
 δῆμῳ πιφαύσκων, ὁ δ' ἀναίνετο μή κεν ἀρέσαι. 500
 Ἀμφῷ δ' ἐξέσθην ἐπὶ ρίστορι πείραρ ἐλίσθαι,
 λαοὶ δ' ἀμφοτέροισιν ἐπήπυνον ἀμφὶς ἀρωγοὶ,
 κήρυκες δ' ἀνὰ λαὸν ἐρήτυον Ἐν δὲ γέροντες
 ἦατ' ἐπὶ ξεστοῖσι λίθοισ' ἱερῷ ἐνὶ κύκλῳ,
 σκῆπτρα δὲ κηρύκων ἐν χέρσ' ἔχον ἀπυοφώνων, 505

499 ἀποκταμένου Scholia 'παρὰ Ζηνοδότῳ ἀποκταμένου, καὶ ἐν ταῖς πλείοσιν, καὶ ἔστιν οὐκ ἀπίθανος ἡ γραφή' Since the question was respecting a murder, it is evident that ἀποκταμένου is preferable to the variant ἀποφθιμένου, which would have been needlessly inexplicit, why Aristarchos against preponderating evidence preferred ἀποφθιμένου is not apparent

ἦτέ' ἄποιν' ἀποδοῦναι Cf Z176 ἦτε σῆμα ριδέσθαι γ173 ἠτέομεν θεὸν φῆναν τέρας κ17 ὁδὸν ἦτεον, οὐδέ τι κείνος ἀνήγατο (confer in οὐ next verse ἀναίνετο) Supply δῆμα or ἐπιρικήα, cf Z46 δῆμα δέξαι ἄποινα. Ω594 οὐ μοι ἀρικήα δῶκεν ἄποινα μ382 εἰ δέ μοι οὐ τίσονται βοῶν ἐπιρική' ἀμοιβήν Translate *entreated to pay an adequate compensation* Mss εὐχετο πάντ' ἀποδοῦναι, where neither εὐχετο nor πάντα yields a satisfactory sense I presume that ἄποινα was first misread as πάντα, and then εὐχετο suggested itself as better agreeing with πάντα. A similar mistake in θ348 τίσειν αἵσιμα πάντα for αἵσιμ' ἄποινα

500 δῆμῳ πιφαύσκων The defendant was explaining to the meeting the amount which he was ready to pay.

ἀναίνετο μή κεν ἀρέσαι. *Refused to be reconciled* Cf I120 ἐθέλω ἀρέσαι δόμεναι τ' ἀπερείσι' (read ἐπαρείσι') ἄποινα The reading ἀρέσαι in the form of ἀρέσθαι has been preserved for us by Zenodotos, though in the Scholia it appears as a glossa upon ἐλίσθαι of the following verse Mss μηδὲν ἐλίσθαι, in which μηδὲν is not homeric, and ἐλίσθαι is against the context as explained in note on v. 498 Probably the corruption was perpetrated of set purpose with the usual object of evading the iamb in the sixth foot.

501. *ἔζεσθην*. *Sat*, i e. *squatted, down*. Mss *ἰέσθην*, which the absence of digamma shows to be wrong.

ἐνὶ ρίστορι. Cobet, Var. Lect 239 'ἐπὶ τινος dicitur de eo apud quem quis accusatur, sive rex sive magistratus est, deinde de iudice apud quem quis causam dicit, deinde de teste aut arbitro coram quo quid fieri dicitur. Exemplorum magna copia' But Dem. 416 ἐπὶ τοῖς δικασταῖς ἔλεγες, where Reiske 'frequentior usus genitivi', Schaefer 'I have myself touched upon this use of the genitive in my note on St Luke 12-57, where I have corrected ἀφ' ἐαυτῶν into ἐφ' ἐαυτῶν and Thuc 1-97-1 ἀπὸ κοινῶν συνόδων βουλευόντων into ἐπὶ κοινῶν

πέραρ The same as *πέρας*, *decision*, for which Liddell and Scott refer to Deinarch 110-15 οἱ τὸ πέρας ἔχοντες τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἀπάντων δικαίων Thus the lengthening of the first syllable must be the same as in *πέρατα* (see note on v 485) for *πέρατα*, so that the form should be *πέραρ*

502 *ἀμφοτέροισιν ἐπήπυον* Scholia 'παρὰ Ζηνοδότῃ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνει ἀμφοτέρωθεν' So also the *Μασσαλιωτική* Probably *ἐκατέρωθεν*, the change being metrical and helped by the following *ἀμφίς* Cf Ψ813 *ἐκάτερθεν ὁμίλου θωρήχθησαν*

503 *κήρυκες δ' ἀνὰ λαὸν ἐρήτυον* I e. *ἀνερήτυον*. *The heralds kept back the multitude* Cf Γ77 *Τρώων ἀνέργε φάλαγγας* P752 *μάχην ἀνέργε ὀπίσω Τρώων* Hymn Her 211 *ἐξοπίσω* (read *εἰσοπίσω*) δ' ἀνέεργε. Mss *ἄρα* without any force See notes on vv 37 and 506

ἐν δὲ γέροντες And depicted in the shield the elders. Mss *οἱ δὲ γέροντες* with a non-homeric article.

504. *ἦατ'*. So Payne Knight. Mss *εἶατ'* The same error in vv. 509 and 523

505 *κηρύκων ἀποφώνων* *Loud-speaking heralds* Cf. H384 *ἡπύτα* (read *ἀπύτα*) *κήρυξ* P324 *κήρυκι* *Ἠπυτίδῃ* (*Ἀπυτίδῃ*?) N521 *βρυήπυος Ἄρης* B184 *κήρυξ ὅς ροι ἄπυε* (Mss for metrical purposes *ὀπήδει*) ι399 *Κύκλωπας μεγάλ' ἦπνε* No doubt *ἀποφώνων* first lapsed to *ἡπνοφώνων* (as in Ξ399 *ἀπύει* lapsed to *ἡπύει*, see note on v. 61) and then to the Mss *ἡεροφώνων*, which is meaningless.

τοῖς' ἀν' ἔπειτ' ἤισσον, ἀμοιβηδὶς δὲ δίκασον·
 κείμεν δ' ἄρ' ἐνὶ μέσσοισι δύο χρυσοῖο τάλαντα
 τῷ δόμεν δς μετὰ τοῖσι δίκην ἰθύτατα ῥέπει.

Ἐν δ' ἱερὴν πόλιν ἄμφι δύο στρατοὶ ἦτο λαῶν
 τεύχεσι λαμπόμενοι τάχα δὲ σφισι ῥάνδανε βουλὴ
 ἡμὲν πραθέμεναι ἢ δ' ἀνδιχα πάντα δάσασθαι,

510

506. τοῖς' ἀν' ἔπειτ' ἤισσον. I.e. ἀνήισσον *With which they then rose* from their seats Cf O6 στῇ δ' ἄρ' ἀναίξας, and often Mss τοῖσιν ἔπειτα ἤισσον, but this means *they rushed or flew* See notes on vv. 37 and 503

ἀμοιβηδὶς Scholia 'Ἀρίσταρχος ἀμοιβηδὸν ὡς κλαγγηδόν'

507. ἐνὶ μέσσοισι Mss ἐν μέσσοισι, the double σ of which is fictitious Cf μεσηγύς See note on v 569

δύο. Mss δύο See note on v. 230 The same error in v 509

508. ἰθύτατα Mss ἰθύντατα with an epenthetic letter for metrical purposes See note on v 64

509 ἐν δ' ἱερὴν (more probably ἱρήν, cf v3 ἱερεύσκον, where ἱερέυσκον would introduce an anapaest) πόλιν Cf H20 Φίλιον εἰς ἱερὴν A366 Δ103, etc Mss τὴν δ' ἐτέρην, where the article is non-homeric. The misreading ἐτέρην was most likely the cause of the missing line before v 497 having been discarded

ἱερὴν *Enclosed*

πόλιν ἄμφι. I.e. ἀμφὶ πόλιν.

δύο στρατοὶ ἦτο λαῶν Die Vorstellung von zwei belagernden Heeren scheint auf Bildwerke zurückzugehen, auf welchen das Belagerungsheer zu beiden Seiten der belagerten Stadt gruppiert war. AMEIS-HENTZE So also FAESI-FRANKE This is most probable (see my note on v 497), and from such a representation Homer may have inferred that there were two armies of attackers—as the division referred to in v. 511 implies—in the same way as in Troy there were two armies of defenders, the Trojans and their auxiliaries.

δύο στρατοὶ λαῶν. The construction seems to be δύο λαῶν στρατοί, *armies of two peoples*. But owing to its proximity to λαοὶ of v 502 λαῶν creates confusion, and it is possible that Homer wrote λάθρη, so that ἦτο λάθρη might mean *were lying in wait* Cf 892 ἐπεφνε λάθρη.

δύο. Mss δύω See note on v 230.

510. τάχα To be taken with πραθέμεναι. *Forthwith to sack* Cf E489 τάχ' ἐκπέρσωσ' ἐν ναιομένην πόλιν Φ309 τάχα ῥάστν μέγα ἐκπέρσει Mss δίχα, a misreading to which the corruption in the next line must have contributed

511 ἡμὲν πραθέμεναι ἢ δ' ἄνδιχα πάντα δάσασθαι *To sack the city and share everything equally* For ἡμὲν-ἡδὲ = τε-τε cf ξ201 οἱ ἐνὶ μεγάρῳ ἡμὲν τράφον ἡδ' ἐγένοντο. ο466 εὔρε δ' ἐνὶ προδόμῳ ἡμὲν δέπα' ἡδὲ τραπέζας, etc Mss ἡὲ διαπραθέειν ἢ ἄνδιχα πάντα δάσασθαι, a corruption which developed when the notion (referred to in the Scholia) was conceived that in accordance with X120 there was a question of dividing the city's goods between the besiegers and the besieged But of such divisions there are no traces except only in the above line X120, which forms part of the spurious vv 111 to 130. See my comment upon those verses A similar mistake probably at λ403 ἡὲ περὶ πόλιος μαχεόμενον (the variant μαχεούμενον, so extensively adopted, is on a par with the egregious διδοῦναι of Ω425 and οὐδὸν for ὀδὸν in ρ196) ἡδὲ γυναικῶν, where perhaps read ἡμὲν μαχόμενον περὶ πόλιος ἡδὲ γυναικῶν, omitting the previous verse, which οἶων shows to be recent Cf ω113.

ἄνδιχα The two sections of the raiders were to share the plunder equally.

δάσασθαι. This verb is not appropriate to the besiegers if the question concerned a division between the besiegers and the besieged, in that case we should rather have expected ἡμῶν δέξασθαι, and some idea of an offer on the part of the latter would have been forthcoming As a reference to a division between the two hostile armies, δάσασθαι would be suited only to the besieged, and this of course is against the context.

κτῆσιν ὄσσην πολίεθρον ἐπήρατον ἐντὸς ἔφεργεν—

οἱ δ' οὐ πω ἐπύθοντο—λόχῳ δ' ἐπὶ θωρήσσοντο

Τείχος μὲν ῥ' ἄλοχοί τε φίλαι καὶ νήπια τέκνα
ῥύατ' ἐφισταότες, μετὰ δ' ἄνδρες οὓς ἔχε γῆρας 515

Οἱ δ' ἴσαν, ἦρχε δ' ἄρα σφιν Ἀρης καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη,

ἄμφω χρυσείῳ, χρύσεια δὲ ρεῖματα ρέσθην,

καλῶ καὶ μεγάλῳ σὺν τεύχεσιν ὥς τε θεῶ περ,

ἄμφις ἀριζήλω λαοὶ δ' ὑπολίζονες ἦσαν

Οἱ δ' ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἴκανον ὅθι σφισι ρεῖκε λοχῆσαι, 520

ἐν ποταμῷ ὅθι τ' ἀρδμὸς ξεν πάντεσι βοτοῖσιν,

ἐνθ' ἄρα τοί γ' ἴζοντ' ἐπιρριμένοι αἴθοπα χαλκόν.

512 ἐπήρατον Considering that the simple is ἐρατὸν or ἐρατεινόν, I suspect that the correct word is ἐπέρατον, for in epic compounds the initial short vowel of the second constituent seems to lengthen only if the first constituent is not a preposition or a prepositional adverb, as we should expect from the fact that prepositions had then a quasi-independent existence. Like mistakes probably are ἀνήμελκτος ἐπήρετμος. See note on v 589

513 οἱ δ' οὐ πω ἐπύθοντο Parenthetically. The citizens within, whose attention was absorbed in the trial, *had not yet received news* of the raid, they learnt it later on as told in v 530. Mss οἱ δ' οὐ πω πείθοντο, which implies that at a later stage the besieged agreed to a division and thus submitted, whereas they come out and fight strenuously. The corruption is due to v 511 in its disfigured state, aided by the usual tendency to avoid a tribrach. Besides, these two verbs are often interchanged; for instance in Thuc 7-44-1

λόχῳ δ' ἐπὶ θωρήσσοντο. *They, i.e. the raiders, armed themselves with a view to an ambush.* Cf. σ44 τὰς ἐπὶ δόρπῳ κατθέμεθα. Herod 1-68 ἐπὶ κακῷ σιδήρος ἀνέιργται, etc. In v 520 the raiders proceed to carry out their treacherous plan. Mss λόχῳ δ' ὑποθωρήσσοντο, which in this form is meaningless, it would have a meaning if written λόχῳ δ' ὑποθωρήσσοντο, but its meaning would then be *they armed themselves under*, i.e. in the secrecy of, *an ambush*. This is inconsistent with v. 520.

514 to 519 The first two lines suggested by Thuc.2-13-7 τοιοῦτοι γὰρ ἐφύλασσον ἀπὸ τε τῶν πρεσβυτάτων καὶ τῶν νεωτάτων and intruded when the end of v 513 was misunderstood to refer to the besieged. The whole passage contains some very objectionable features (1) the defence by women, (2) οὓς ἔχε γῆρας instead of γέροντες, (3) the defence by babes, (4) ἀμφίς instead of ἄμφω, (5) ὑπολίζονες, (6) they make οἱ δ' ὅτε ἱκανον of v 520 refer to the besieged.

519 ὑπολίζονες. So Payne Knight, Brandreth, Monro-Allen. It reproduces ὑφήςσων of Hesiod Her 258, which must have preceded our passage, since our passage is spurious. Most editors prefer ἐπ' ὀλίζονες under the misapprehension that it is Hesiodos who was the imitator and who read ἐπ' ὀλίζονες as one word.

520 ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἱκανον. Objected to by Nauck. Perhaps ὅτε τῇδ' ἱκανον.

521 ἐν ποταμῷ. The ambush of course was not to be laid in a river, and therefore ἐν ποταμῷ belongs to ἱκανον and not to λοχῆσαι. The normal construction of verbs of motion in classical works is with εἰς and not ἐν, still (1) we have Thuc 4 42-3 ἐν Ἀμπρακίᾳ καὶ ἐν Λευκάδι ἀπήεσαν αὐτῶν πεντακόσιοι φρουροί, where, though editors, to avoid what they conceive to be a solecism, write ἀπήσαν, the context shows ἀπήεσαν to be the correct reading, and (2) Meisterhans, p 176, records that in classical inscriptions θεῖναι and καταθεῖναι are joined with both εἰς and ἐν. It is possible, however, that εἰς ποταμὸν was modified by attraction to λοχῆσαι.

ἐν. So Brandreth. Mss ἐην.

πάντεσι (Mss πάντεσσι) βοτοῖσιν. *To beasts of all kinds.* Cf. A5 οἰωνοῖσι τε πᾶσι, where Nauck adopted the Zenodotean lection οἰωνοῖσι τε δαῖτα and thus stirred up a homeric battle between Königsberg and St Petersburg, in which the latter was thoroughly discomfited.

522 ἐνθ' ἄρα τοί γ'. The addition of τοί γε is sheer padding. Perhaps ἐνθα ῥ' ἔπειτα. So Ξ404 τῇ ῥα.

ἵζοντ' ἐπιρριμένοι αἰθοπα χαλκόν. Cf. T233 ρεσσάμενοι χροὶ χαλκόν. Mss ἵζοντ' εἰλυμένοι αἰθοπι χαλκῷ, in which the absence of digamma discloses the error. Bentley conjectured ἵζον ρεβλυμένοι, but ἐλύω or εἰλύω signifies *to crouch*, a sense foreign to the context. The same

Τοῖσι δ' ἔπειτ' ἀπένευθε δύο σκοποὶ ἦτο λαῶν
 δέχμενοι ὅποτε μῆλα ριδοῖατο καὶ ρέλικας βοῦς·
 τὰ δὲ τάχα προγένοντο, δύο δ' ἄμ' ἔποντο νομέε 525
 τερπομένῳ σύριγξι, δόλον δ' οὐ πω προνόησαν.
 Οἱ μὲν βοτὰ ριδόντες ἐπέδραμον, ὦκα δ' ἔπειτα
 τάμνοντ' ἄμφι βοῶν ἀγέλας καὶ πώεα μῆλων,
 αἰγῶν ἢ δ' οἴων, κτεῖνον δ' ἐπιμηλοβοτῆρας.
 Οἱ δ' ὥς οὖν ἐπύθοντο πολὺν κέλαδον παρὰ βουσὶν 530
 ἐδράων προπάροιθε καθήμενοι, αὐτίκ' ἐφ' ἵππων

correction is necessary in P492 E186 ξ479 In v352 for εἰλύαται read ρεῖλιάται (from ρέλλω) In ξ136 for εἰλυμένα the right reading seems to be κεκαλυμμένα, as in Φ319 and ε403 it is καλύψω κεκάλυπτο for εἰλύσω εἴλυτο. The verses M286 and Π640, where εἰλύαται and εἴλυτο occur, are in parts certainly spurious

523. ἦτο So Payne Knight Mss εἶατο.

λαῶν. Gehört zu ἀπένευθε LA ROCHE

Achilles Tatios had our passage in view in writing 4-14 ἦσαν δὲ τῶν πραττομένων σκοποὶ πόρρωθεν, οὓς οἱ βουκόλοι προκαθίσαντες ἐκέλευον, εἰ διαβαίνοντας ἴδοιεν τοὺς πολεμίους κτλ, but he also mistook the spies as having been set by the νομέες

524 δέχμενοι So Cobet Mss δέγγμενοι

ὅποτε. Mss ὅπποτε See note on v 115

525. τὰ δέ. Comprehensively Probably τὰ of v 527 was suggested by τὰ of this verse Mss οἱ δέ, assimilated to the foregoing σκοποὶ for the sake of gaining a dactyl.

προγένοντο. Πρὸ οδοῦ ἐγένοντο, μῆθ' ἔν ἀλλαχοῦ [Δ382] EUSTATHIOS Cf. Theoc 24-52 οἱ δ' αἴψα προγένοντο 25-134 (Ahrens, p. 256) Callim. Art 178

νομέε τερπομένῳ So Aristophanes, except that he wrote νομῆε, for which see note on v 2. All Mss but one exhibit the plural.

526. δόλον. Qu λόχον as in v. 513

527. βοτὰ ριδόντες To this leads βοτοῖσιν of v. 521. Mss τὰ προ-ιδόντες, in which the preposition is objectless

528 πῶσα μῆλων This lection, which is demanded by ἐπιμηλοβοτῆρας, has been preserved by Apollonios Soph. v. τάμνεν, and it seems to me preferable to the colourless πῶσα καλὰ of our Mss. This combination recurs only in the spurious verses λ402 μ129, besides v. 112 of the ω rhapsody, which is a recent production; in all probability in these verses it was suggested by the one under study after its mutilation.

529 αἰγῶν ἢ δ' ὄνων Cf. K485 μῆλοισιν, αἶγεσιν ἢ ὄνι. ι184 μῆλ', οἰέσ τε καὶ αἶγες. Mss. ἀργενῶν ὄνων. But not only does αἰγῶν add something more substantial to the description, but it is also demanded by μῆλων, which includes both sheep and goats.

κτεῖνον δ' ἐπιμηλοβοτῆρας Those set over the μῆλα, the shepherds. The preposition as in γ422 ἐπιβουκόλος, μ131 ἐπιποιμένες, ν405 ὧν ἐπίορος (Mss. ἐπίορος), N450 Μίνωα Κρήτη ἐπίορον, ν222 ἐπιβότορι (Mss. ἐπιβώτορι), ρ455 ἐπιστάτη, Theocr. 8-6 ἐπίοιρε βοῶν, Σ554 ἐπαμαλλοδετῆρες ἐφέστασαν, ξ66 ῥέργον ᾧ ἐπιμίνω, 104 ἐπὶ δ' ἄνδρες ὄρονται, ρ537 οὗ γὰρ ἐπ' ἄνθρωπος, π144 ἐπὶ ῥέργα ῥιδεῖν, ν209 ἐπὶ βοῦσιν εἰσε, 220 μένοντα βοῦσιν ἐπ' ἄλλοτρίῃσιν, φ142 ὅθεν τ' ἐπιραιοχοεύει (so a variant, most Mss. ὅθεν τέ περ ραιοχοεύει), Ω729 ἐπίσκοπος. So ἐπιμέλομαι. In the following words ἐπὶ has been corrupted into ὑπό. δ386 ὑποδμῶς. ο330 ὑποδρηστήρες. 333 ὑποδράουσιν. Z19 ὑφηνίοχος. In the Mss. κτεῖνον δ' ἐπὶ μῆλοβοτῆρας the preposition is meaningless.

530. ἐπύθοντο Probably ἤσθοντο as better agreeing with κέλαδον. If so, we should likewise write ἤσθοντο in v. 513.

531. ἐδράων The privileged seats assigned to the elders, before which the people squatted awaiting the decision as described in v. 501. Cf. M310 τετιμήμεσθα μάλιστα ἔδρη. θ16 ἔμπληντ' ἀνδρῶν (Mss. ἔμπληντο βροτῶν) ἀγοραί τε καὶ ἔδραι. Mss. εἰράων. Probably also in Hesiod Theog. 803 ἐπιμίσγεται αὐτῆς εἰρέας ἀθανάτων we should write ἔδρησ'.

προπάροιθε I am not confident that this is a genuine form, I do not see whence the iota could have proceeded. I surmise that by analogy with ἐγγύς-ἐγγύθι the true form is πάρος-πάροθι-προπάροθι, the iota being epenthetic as explained in note on v. 76. It follows

βάντες ἀερσιπύδων μετεκίαθον, αἶψα δ' ἵκοντο
 Στησάμενοι δ' ἐμάχοντο μάχην ποταμοῖο παρ' ὄχθας,
 βάλλον δ' ἀλλήλους χαλκήρεσιν ἐγχείρῃσιν.

Ἐν δ' Ἔρις, ἐν δὲ Κυδοιμὸς ὀμίλειον, ἐν δ' ὅλῃ Κῆρ, 535

ἄλλον ζῶν ἔχουσα νεύτατον, ἄλλον ἄουτον,
 ἄλλον τεθνηῶτα κατὰ μόθον ἔλκε ποδοῖν

ρεῖμα δ' ἔχ' ἀμφ' ὤμοισι δαφοινεὸν αἵματι φωτῶν

Ὀμίλειον δ' ὥς τε ζωὸς βροτοὶ ἦδ' ἐμαχοντο,

νεκρούς τ' ἀλλήλων ῥέρον κατατεθνηῶτας 540

Ἐν δ' ἐτίθη νεῖδον μαλακὴν, πείριαν ἄρουραν

εὐρεῖαν τρίπολον, πολλοὶ δ' ἀροτῆρες ἐν αὐτῇ

ζεύγε' ἀναπολέοντες ἐλάστρεον ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα

Οἱ δ' ὁπότε στρέψαντες ἰκοῖατο τέλσον ἀρούρης,

that in Ψ459 παρότεροι would be the right reading, not παροίτεροι. And that the suffix is -θι and not -θε is made probable by the fact that ἀγχόθε αὐτόθε ἐγγύθε ἔνδοθε ἔνθε ἐντεῦθε do not exist

532 μετεκίαθον, αἶψα δ' ἵκοντο Qu ἔλκειον, which may have been tampered with in order to eliminate the iamb in the concluding foot For, when it is said that after pursuit one overtakes one's enemy or rival, the verb employed is invariably κίγχανω Cf 153 κίχεν λαός τε καὶ ἵπποι Ψ524 ἀλλά μιν αἶψα κίχανεν Α367 ἄλλους ἐπὶ ῥίσσομαι ὃν κε κίχέω Ε334 ἐκίχανε πολὺν καθ' ὁμίλον ὀπάζων (read ἐφέπων)

535 to 538 Foisted in from Hes Her.156 ff, where they suit the general character of the description, here they are out of keeping, for the other scenes described are eminently human throughout Indeed, the words ἄουτον (for ἄνουτον) ὀμίλειον δαφοινεὸν alone suffice to unmask the forger Heyne was the first to condemn them, but oddly enough retained vv 539 and 540, though these are particularly obnoxious They do not figure in Hesiod's description, and therefore must be the interpolator's own invention, who surpassed himself by saying that the combatants were not merely depicted but actually fought as living warriors

542 εὐρεῖαν. Probably βαθεῖαν as in v 547, altered with the object of replacing the iamb by a spondee It is much more likely that

in describing ploughing the poet praised his field for its fertility (πίεραν) and deep soil, and not for its size which adds nothing essential to the picture

τρίπολον. Ploughing in Greece is done twice, 1 e first about the beginning of September immediately after the first rains, and secondly one week before sowing in November. The third operation implied in τρίπολον is not ploughing but harrowing.

543 ζεύγε' ἀναπολέοντες ἐλάστρεον Construe ζεύγε' with ἐλάστρεον *In ploughing they drove the teams* For ἀναπολέω = *to plough* cf 542 τρίπολον Pind Pyth. 6-1 Ἀφροδίτας ἄρουραν ἀναπολίζομεν Theoc 25-25 τριπόλοισι σπύρον ἐν νειοῖσιν βάλλοντες καὶ τετραπόλοισιν Soph Phil 1238 δις ταῦτ' αὖ βούλει καὶ τρίς (cf τρίπολον) ἀναπολεῖν μ' ἔπη, where Blaydes quotes the Scholia 'ἀπὸ τῶν δεύτερον ἀναπολούντων τὴν ἡροτραμένην γῆν' At Ant 341 πολέων (γᾶν) Schol στρέφον, βωλοκοποῦν Mss ζεύγεα δινεύοντες, which seems to me to mean nothing, and is palpably wrong, for the verb should have been δινέοντες, no doubt it represents an attempt at discarding the tribrach The same proceeding recurs in 5811, for πωλέ' ἐπεὶ should rather be πολέ' ἐπεὶ.

ἐλάστρεον A ἀπαξ εἰρημένον in Homer.

544 οἱ δ' ὅποτε στρέψαντες ἰκοίαιτο The optative as in Arist Plut 1010 εἰ λυπουμενὴν γ' αἰσθοιτό με, νητάριον ὑπεκορίζετ' ἄν Soph Phil. 289 πρὸς δὲ τοῦθ' ὁ μοι βάλοι ἄτρακτος, αὐτὸς ἄν εἰλυόμεν Isocr Or 6 § 60 εἰ εἰς μόνος Λακεδαιμονίων βοηθήσειεν, ὑπὸ πάντων ἄν ὁμολογεῖτο (*would perhaps be allowed, not used to be allowed* as Jebb interprets at Soph Phil 291) παρὰ τοῦτον γενέσθαι τὴν σωτηρίαν

στρέψαντες. Supply ἄρουραν See note on previous verse Cf Xen Oec 16-15 τὴν γῆν στρέφειν Scholia on v 542 τρίπολον 'τρίς ἑστραμμένην καὶ ἡροτρασμένην' Paley at Hesiod Op. 460 πολεῖν quotes βωλοστροφεῖν from a gloss and τὰς βώλους τῆς γῆς ἀνάστρεφε τῇ δικέλλῃ from Tzetzes. In MGK στρέμμα means *an acre*, 1 e as much as is supposed to be ploughed in one day with a team of oxen The same is the meaning of πέλεθρον, a derivative from the same root as πολέω = στρέφω. Previous commentators have gone astray over the tenor of στρέψαντες.

τοῖσι δ' ἔπειτα δέπας μελιρῆδός ἐν χερὶ ροῖνον 545
 δῶκ' ἂν ἀνὴρ ἐπιών· τοὶ δὲ στρέψασκον ἂν ὄγμους
 ριέμενοι νειοῖο βαθείης τέλσον ἰκέσθαι.
 Ἡ δὲ μελαίνετ' ὀπισθεν, ἀρηρομένη δὲ ρεροίκει
 χροσείη περ εἴουσα τὸ δὴ περὶ θαῦμα τέτυκτο.
 Ἐν δ' ἐτίθη τέμενος βαθυλήιον, ἔνθα δ' ἔριθοι 550
 ἥμαον ὀξείας δρεπάνας ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντες
 Δράγματα δ' ἄλλα μετόγμι' ἐπήτριμα πίπτον ἔραζε,
 ἄλλα δ' ἀμαλλοδετήρες ἐν ἑλλεδανοῖσι δίδεντο.
 Τρεῖς δ' ἐπαμαλλοδετήρες ἐφέστασαν, ἀτὰρ ὀπισθε

545. ἔπειτα δέπας μελιρῆδός ἐν χερὶ ροῖνον. Mss ἔπειτ' ἐν χερσὶ δέπας μελιρῆδός οῖνον with a neglected digamma Corrected by Bentley

546. δῶκ' ἂν *Would (perhaps) give.* For this idiomatic use of ἂν see Liddell and Scott (1869) v. ἂν in A-III-1 and the examples in my note on v 544 It is fully illustrated by Blaydes at Soph Phil 289 For aorist cf N734 μάλιστα δέ κ' αὐτὸς ἀνέγνω (misunderstood by both the ancient and modern commentators, the latter going so far as to debase the text by writing δέ τ') A218 ὅς κε θεοῖς ἐπιτίθηται, μάλα κ' (most Mss and I think all editors τ') ἔκλνον αὐτοῦ Arist Plut 982 δραχμὰς ἂν ἤτησ' εἰκοσιν εἰς ἱμάτιον, καὶ ταῖς ἀδελφαῖς ἀγοράσαι χιτῶνια ἐκέλευσεν ἂν, πρῶν τ' ἂν ἐδεῖθῃ μεδίμνων τεττάρων Mss δόσκειν as though the wine were offered repeatedly, whereas it was only offered when the ploughers reached the end of the field, therefore once The error induced by the adjacent στρέψασκον

στρέψασκον ἂν ὄγμους. I e ἀναστρέψασκον ὄγμους, *they went on ploughing up the furrows.* See above The whole description is that, when they ploughed to the end of the acre, the labourers were rewarded with a draught of fine wine, so that they were eager to reach that end. This description also has been misunderstood by previous commentators, who accept ὄγμους not as the object of ἀναστρέψαντες but as being connected with ἀνὰ, and then take στρέψαντες as = *returning*

As no other reward for the cultivators is specified, we are perhaps to conclude that they were either serfs, or *métayers* who shared the produce with the landlord.

547. Cf Moschos 4-99 *ἔπει δὴ παντὸς ἀφίκετο πρὸς τέλος ἔργον, καρτερὸν οἰνοφόροις πονεῦμενος ἔρκος ἀλωῆς.*

549 The effect of this beautiful description is marred by this inept addition Homer graphically says that the portion behind the plougher was depicted black, and by its tint looked as though it really were ploughed, the interpolator in his partiality for wonders destroys all this by saying that it was not black but golden, which is the same as if he said that it did not look like ground ploughed The Scholiast sought out an explanation by saying 'σκιὰν εἰκὸς ἐγκείσθαι τῷ χρυσῷ' A similar intruder is τ229 to 231

550 βαθυλήιον Previous editors have referred to Δ560 *κείρει τ' εἰσελθὼν βαθὺ λήιον* and to the parallel passage in Hesiod Her 288 *ἔην βαθὺ λήιον* The variant *βασιλήιον* was created under the influence of *βασιλεὺς* of v 556

552 *μετόγμ' ἰε τὰ μεταξύ τῶν ὄγμων*, as *μετόρχιον* (Arist.Pax,568) = *τὸ μεταξύ τῶν ὄρχων* Eustathios mentions the similarly formed adjective *ἐπόγμιος* Compare also *μεταμάζιος μεταδήμιος μεταδόρπιος ἐφίστιος ἐνίπνιος ἐπήρετος ἐπομφάλιος ὑπασπίδια ὑποχείριος*, etc. Mss *μετ' ὄγμον*, which is erroneous, for according to v 546 there was more than one furrow

553 *ἐν ἠλλεδανοῖσι* This recurs in Hymn Dem 456 and Hesiod Her 291 Scholia '*παρὰ τὸ ἐνελείσθαι ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς πυρὸς*,' which etymology is adopted by vHerwerden in his Index Etymologicus With such a derivation the true reading would be *ῥελλεδανοῖσι* without the preposition Another scholion says '*τοῖς τῶν ἀσταχύνων δεσμοῖς οὓς οὐλοδέτας καλοῦσιν*' and Eustathios mentions the neuter *οὐλόδετον* Accordingly one might suggest *ἐν οὐλοδέτοισι* Or *ῥιλλεδανοῖσι*, a diminutive of *ῥιλλάσι*, cf N572 *ῥιλλάσιν δήσαντες*

δίδεντο So Cobet Mss *δέοντο*

554. *ἐπαμัลλοδετήρες* See note on v 529 Mss *ἄρ' ἀμάλλοδετήρες*, but the adverb has no force.

παῖδες δραγμαύοντες, ἐν ἀγκαλίδεσι φέροντες, 555
 ἀσπερχές παρέχον. Βασιλεὺς δ' ἐν τοῖσι σιωπῇ
 σκῆπτρον ἔχων ἐστήκει ἐπ' ὄχθου γηθόσυνος κήρ.
 Κήρυκες δ' ἀπάνευθεν ὑπὸ δρυὶ δαῖτα πένοντο,
 βοῦν δ' ἱερεύσαντες μέγαν ἄμφεπον ἐν δὲ γυναῖκες
 δεῖπνον ἐρίθοισιν λεύκ' ἄλφιστα πολλά τ' ἄλεον. 560
 Ἐν δ' ἐτίθη σταφυλῇσι μέγα βρίθουσαν ἀλωῇν
 καλὴν χρυσεῖην, μέλανες δ' ἀνὰ βότρυνες ἦσαν,
 ἐστήκει δὲ κάμαξι διαμπερὲς ἀργυρέησιν.

555 ἀγκαλίδεσι So from one Ms Otherwise ἀγκαλίδεσσι

556 βασιλεὺς The person overseeing the work must be the *proprietor*, and I doubt whether βασιλεὺς can have such a meaning I suspect that instead of the Ms reading παρέχον βασιλεὺς Homer wrote παρέχοντο (the middle as διδεντο) ῥάναξ, and that the change was made in order to avoid the hiatus ensuing after the loss of the digamma. I may mention that Eustathios by his rendering οἰκοδεσπότης means *proprietor*, as confirmed by the MGk νοικοκύρης (= οἰκοκύριος)

557. ἐπ' ὄχθου Upon an elevated spot, whence the proprietor could survey the work, compare the imitative passage of Apoll Rhod 2.1026 ἐν ὑψίστῳ βασιλεὺς μυσσινι θαάσσων Mss ἐπ' ὄγμου, which is out of the question, making as it does the proprietor sit among the furrows. For ὄχθος = *elevation* see Scholia at v 5 ὄχθοι τὰ ὑψηλά Xen Anab 4.3.3 πεζοὺς ἐπὶ ταῖς ὄχθαις παρατεταγμένους ἄνω τῶν ἵππέων, where, as ἄνω τῶν ἵππέων shows, the proper lection is τοῖς ὄχθοις At this place Pantazides, though out of too scrupulous a conservatism he retains ὄχθαις, mentions that a Lexicographer quotes τὰ τῆς γῆς ὑψώματα as an interpretation of ὄχθοι, and further refers to Xen Hipp. 3.7 ἐπ' ὄχθους ἀγορεύειν Hippai 6.5 ἀπ' ὄχθων καταίρειν 8.3 ἐπ' ὄχθους ἀνάλλεσθαι. MGk has retained ὄχθος in the form ὄχτος as = *elevation*, whether great or small

559 *ιερεύσαντες* Barnes *ιερεύσαντες*, which is most probably right. *ἐν δὲ γυναῖκες*. *Ms* αἱ δὲ *γυναῖκες* with a non-homeric article, respecting which Eustathios to the point 'περιττὸν τὸ ἄρθρον'

560. *λευκ' ἄλφιστα πολλά τ' ἄλεον* *Pounded plenty of white meal* In the preparation of bread pounding was the chief part in the eyes of primitive people—and that is the reason why the women employed in the preparation of bread were called *ἀλετριδές*—for it was done by means of mortar and pestle (cf. Hesiod. Op 423 *ὄλμον μὲν τριπόδην τάμνειν, ὑπερον δὲ τρίπηχυν*. Arist Vesp. 238 *τῆς ἀρτοποιίδος ἐκλέψαμεν τὸν ὄλμον*), and entailed pretty hard labour, as we can gather from v105, where the slave girl curses the suitors for whose benefit she was obliged to toil at pounding Cf also Call Del 242 *μογέουσιν ἀλετριδές* The kneading part afterwards was a simple and uninteresting affair, probably there was no real kneading as we know it, but the dough was merely cut up into rather small pieces, which were pressed into thin cakes, as the chopattis are prepared in India In the present case, after mentioning the roasting of the ox for the company, it was natural that the poet should say a word about the preparation by pounding of the bread for the labourers, the rather if the preparation of the bread was a daily work as in India. The text is *λευκ' ἄλφιστα πολλά πάλυνον*, *sprinkled*, which is supposed to refer to the sprinkling of flour over the roast, but that was the business of the roasters (cf 576 *ὀπήσας παρέθηκ' Ὀδυσσεὶ θερμ' αὐτοῖς ὀβελοῖσιν, ὃ δ' ἄλφιστα λευκὰ πάλυνεν*), who were men and not women. That the text is corrupt we have another indication in the absence of the double conjunctive which with two exceptions (I639 Ω381) exists when to *πολλά* another adjective is joined, as for instance in B213 *ἀκοσμά τε πολλά τε*. Ω204 *πολέας τε καὶ ἐσθλοὺς*. The anxiety to discard a *μείουρος* must have suggested the expedient of assimilating our sentence to λ28 *ἐπὶ δ' ἄλφιστα λευκὰ πάλυνον* and Δ640 577

563 *κάμαξι διαμπερές ἀργυρέσιν*. Zenodotos *ἀργυρέουσιν*, a variant which is likewise found at Hes. Her. 298. It is perhaps preferable The verse, however, seems spurious

Ἄμφι δὲ κυανέην κάπετον, περὶ δ' ἔρκος ἔλασε
 κασσιτέριοι, μέλαινα δ' ἀταρπιτὸς ἦεν ἐπ' αὐτῇ, 565
 τῇ νίσσοντο φορέες ὅτε τρυγάοιεν ἀλωήν.
 Παρθενικαὶ δὲ καὶ ἡῖθεοι ἀταλὰ φρονέοντες
 πλεκτοῖσ' ἐν ταλάροισι φέρον μελιρῥιδέα καρπὸν.
 Τοῖσι δὲ νεομένοισι πάϊς φόρμιγγι λιγείῃ
 ἱμερόεν κιθάριζε, λίνον δ' ὑπὸ καλὸν αἶειδε 570
 λεπταλέῃ φωνῇ, τοὶ δὲ, πλήσσοντες ἀμαρτῇ
 μολπήν τ' ἰλυγμῶ τε ποσὶ, σκαίροντες ἔποντο
 Ἐν δ' ἀγέλην ποίησε βοῶν ὀρθοκραιράων,

565 κασσιτέριοι, μέλαινα δ' ἀταρπιτός The path was depicted black, as the grapes also were, and as the vineyard was made of gold, the vine-poles of silver, the ditch of *kyanos*, and the hedge of tin. Mss κασσιτέριον, μία δ' οἷα ἀταρπιτός; but for what reason should so much emphasis be laid upon the fact that there was only one path and no more leading into the vineyard? The emphasis would be intelligible if we could imagine vineyards into which several paths led

ἀταρπιτός A path was opened into the vineyard, which was surrounded by αἰμασιὰς, a dense hedge of thorny plants or branches, it is so practised in East Africa as a protection against wild animals Cf. ω224 αἰμασιὰς λέγοντες ἀλωῆς ἔμεναι ἔρκος So is Theokritos's vineyard in Idyl 1-46 surrounded αἰμασιαῖς, or φραγμοῖς ἡκανθωμένοις as the Scholiast paraphrases.

ἦεν. Probably ἦγεν, and so likewise in χ128 ἦν ὁδὸς εἰς λαύρην Cf. Soph OT 734 ὁδὸς ἐς ταῦτ' ἄγει

566 τρυγάοιεν So Payne Knight Mss τρυγῶφεν or τρυγῶωεν, both monstrous forms Why Nauck has proposed τρυγῶοιεν I am unable to understand, the verb is τρυγάω, so preserved to the present day

569 τοῖσι δὲ νεομένοισι They danced merrily on their return home after completing their vintage Pernot, L'Isle de Chio p 168, says 'Comme nous étions à la fontaine, nous vîmes descendre du coteau

voisin, par un sentier en lacet, une théorie de villageois vêtus de blanc et précédés d'une cornemuse Ils avaient terminé quelque travail champêtre et s'en réjouissaient à leur façon Ils s'arrêtèrent à la porte du village et commencèrent une danse au rythme lent [= *λίνον*], à laquelle prient part quelques femmes ' This is on all fours with the homeric description as corrected by *νεομένοισι* Mss *τοῖσιν δ' ἐν μέσσοισι*, but (1) the player would be at the head of the procession so as not to impede the dancing; cf *ψ133 ἀοιδὸς ἔχων φόρμιγγα λιγείαν ἡγείσθω*, and (2) *μέσσοισι* with the antepenultimate long is impossible Whoever tampered with the original text was probably desirous of eliminating the tribrach in the second foot, and it struck him that he could do so by imitating Hesiod. Her 201 *ἐν δ' ἄρα μέσσω ἱμερόεν κιθάριζε Διὸς καὶ Λητοῦς υἱός*, but he did not notice an essential difference, i.e. that Homer describes a dance in a forward movement whereas Hesiod's dance is cyclic

παῖς I very much doubt its correctness as an alternative of *παῖς*. Possibly *νέος*, a youth How is it that we never find *παίδος παίδες* and so forth?

571 *λεπταλέη* Recurring in post-classical poets, in Homer it is a *ἄπαξ εἰρημένον*. It does not appear right.

πλήσσοντες. Supply *οὔδας*—which must also be supplied to *παίσατε* of 0251—and connect with *ποσί* Cf 0264 *πέπληγον δὲ χορὸν* (= the dancing-place) *θέιον(?) ποσίν*, referred to by Eustathios Theoc. 18-7 *ἄειδον ἐγκροτέουσιν ποσσί*. Call Del. 306 *ποδὶ πλήσσονσι* (as here) *χορίτιδες οὔδας* Apoll. Rhod 4-1194 *ὑπαι φόρμιγγος πέδον κροτέοντα πεδίλῳ*. Ω261 *χοροτυπήσιν* Mss *ρήσσοντες*, which is unsuitable, being a post-classical form of *ρήγνυμι*, cf Moeris ' *ρήγνύασι ἀπτικῶς, ῥήσσουσιν ἐλληρικῶς* ' Poets of that period employed *ῥήσσω* as = *to dance*, having taken it from this homeric verse after its corruption

573. *βοῶν ὀρθοκραιράων*. This adjective in connexion with *βοῶν* recurs in μ348 and the spurious verse ©231. It is supposed to be a compound of *ὀρθός* + *κέρας* or *κάρα*, but it is not obvious how *κερ* or *καρ* could eventuate in *κραιρ*. Perhaps *ὀρθοκαρήνων*, cf. Ψ260 *βοῶν ἴφθιμα κάρηνα* In Hymn Her 209 we find *βουσὶν ἐικραίρησιν*,

[αἱ δὲ βόες χρυσοῖο τετεύχато κασσιτέρου τε,]
 μυκηθμῷ δ' ἀπὸ χόρτου ἐπεσεύοντο ποτόνδε 575
 κὰπ ποταμὸν Κελάδοντα παρ' Ἀρκάδιον δονακῶνα.
 Χρυσῆϊοι δὲ νομέες ἄμ' ἐστιχάοντο βόεσι
 τέσσαρες, ἐνέα δὲ σφί κύνες ἄργοι ἄμ' ἔποντο
 Σμερδαλέω δὲ λέοντε δὺ' ἐν πρώτῃσι βόεσσι
 ταῦρον ἐρύγμηλον ἐχέτην, ὃ δὲ μακρὰ μεμυκῶς 580
 ἔλκετο τῷ δὲ κύνες μετεκίαθον ἧδ' αἰζήοι.

which must be an imitation of our βοῶν ὀρθοκραϊράων See note on v. 3
 Sophokles, however, in Tr 13 says βούπρωρος, did he therefore find
 ὀρθοπρωράων?

574. Probably corrupt, for it seems unlikely that Homer represented the cattle as being both of gold and tin The verse probably suggested by Ψ503 ἄρματα δὲ χρυσῷ πεπυκασμένα κασσιτέρῳ τε

575 ἀπὸ χόρτου ἐπεσεύοντο ποτόνδε The herd *after grazing* joyfully rushed down to the river to drink Cf. N492 μῆλα πτόμενα ἐκ βοτάνης (= *after grazing*, see note on v. 492). κ159 (ἐλαφος) ποταμόνδε κατήιεν ἐκ νομοῦ ὕλης πτόμενος Z506 ff Accordingly I have written ποτόνδε instead of the Mss νομόνδε

χόρτου Mss κόπρου I cannot believe that a courtyard could be called κόπρος as if cattle repaired specially thither to relieve themselves The word in the same sense recurs in κ411, where, in my view, it is equally erroneous, having probably been suggested by its occurrence in our passage, there αὐλιν would suit the context, cf μ265 μυκηθμοῦ τ' ἤκουσα βοῶν αὐλιζομένων I have been led to my guess χόρτου, *feeding*, from Hesiod Op 452 χορτάζειν ἔλικας βόας

ἐπεσεύοντο Mss ἐπεσεσύνοντο A good illustration of the pernicious habit of duplication.

576 κὰπ ποταμὸν Κελάδοντα Towards the river (cf B47 ἔβη κατὰ νείας, etc) Keladon, the Arcadian river A place is specified as in B461 Ἀσίῳ ἐν λειμῶνι Κανστρίου ἀμφὶ ῥέεθρα. Mss πὰρ ποταμόν, but the reiteration of the preposition imparts an oratorical colour incompatible with Homer's simple style Cf Δ167 μέσον κὰπ πεδίον

παρ' ἐρινεὸν ἐσεύοντο. Φ3 πεδίονδε δῖωκε πρὸς πόλιν In Φ206 it is clear that παρ ποταμὸν should be κατ ποταμὸν

παρ' Ἀρκάδιον δονακῶνα. *Near the Arcadian reed-thicket* Mss παρὰ ραδιὺν ραδαλὸν ροδαλὸν ραδανὸν (Hesychios), none of which yields any sense. Mss also give δονακῆα, but the suffix -εὺς denotes the agent, and not the place as clearly the context requires, the place is expressed by -ὼν as λειμὼν καλαμῶν πευκῶν ἐλαιῶν, etc. Instead of Ἀρκάδιον I thought also of Ἀπιδανὸν (cf. Callim Zeus 14 Ἀπιδανῆς) or Ἑριδανὸν (both Ἀπιδανὸς and Ἑριδανὸς are repeatedly mentioned in the Argonautica), but on the whole I think Ἀρκάδιον is more likely

δονακῶνα. Theog 785 Εὐρώτα δονακοτρόφον

578 τέσσαρες The primitive form I suspect was τέσαρες, for had it been τέσ-σαρες, it does not seem to me that assimilation of the double consonant to the initial τ could have ensued, such as we find in τέταρτος Furthermore πίσυρες, which is presumed to be Aeolic, in all probability is nothing but τέσαρες, having been coined to meet those cases where the rhythm demands a short antepenultimate.

ἐνέα. So ἐνατος ἐνεήκοντα, forms which fit everywhere Mss ἐννέα which along with εἰνάκις is only pseudo-metrical So is ἐννήκοντα in τ174, where the correct form ἐνεήκοντα figures as a variant

κύνες ἀργοὶ ἄμ' ἔποντο Cf v145 ἄμα τῷ γε δύο κύνες ἀργοὶ ἔποντο (as Bekker wrote) So also β11 ρ62. Mss κύνες πόδας ἀργοὶ ἔποντο But to accompany is always expressed I think by ἄμα ἔσομαι, then why should only the feet of dogs be white? The change was made in order to get rid of the iamb.

579 to 586 A late intruder, concocted from vv P61 to 67 and A176 The peaceful picture of the cattle joyfully lowing whilst proceeding to the river to drink is ruined by the tragic addition of one of their number being at the same time devoured by wild beasts. Indeed, this addition is incompatible in every particular with the foregoing description The interpolator is amply betrayed by his diction, 1 e ἐρύγμηλον λαφύσσειον ὑλάκτεον ἀλέοντο (instead of λαφυσσέτην ὕλαον ἀλέεινον) οἱ νομῆες ἐνδίσσαν ἀπετρωπῶντο Faesi-Franke are justifiably puzzled and remark 'Wie freilich die Vor-

Τὼ μὲν ἀναρρήξαντε βοὸς μέγαλοιο βοείην,
 ἔγκατα καὶ μέλαν αἶμα λαφύσσετον, οἱ δὲ νομῆες
 αὐτῶς ἐνδίοσαν ταχίας κύνας ὀτρύνοντες.

Οἱ δ' ἦτοι δακέειν μὲν ἀπετρωπῶντο λεόντων, 585
 ἰστάμενοι δὲ μάλ' ἐγγὺς ὑλάκτεον ἐκ τ' ἀλέοντο.

Ἐν δὲ νομὸν ποίησε περικλυτὸς ἀμφιγυόεις
 ἐν καλῇ βήσση ὄϊων μέγαν ἀργεννάων,
 σταθμούς τε κλισίας τε κατρεφέας ἰδὲ σηκούς.

Ἐν δὲ χορὸν ποίκιλλε περικλυτὸς ἀμφιγυήεις, 590
 τῷ ρίκελον οἷον ποτ' ἐνὶ Κνωσῷ εὐρείῃ
 Δαίδαλος ἤσκησεν καλλιπλοκάμῳ Ἀριάδῃ.

Ἔνθα μὲν ἡίθεοι καὶ παρθένοι ἀλφεσίβοιαι
 ὠρχεῦντ' ἀλλήλων ἐπὶ καρπῷ χεῖρας ἔχοντες
 Τῶν δ' αἱ μὲν λεπτὰς ὀθόνας ἔχον, οἱ δὲ χιτῶνας 595
 ρεῖατ' ἐννήτους ἦκα στίλβοντας ἐλαίῳ
 καὶ ῥ' αἱ μὲν καλὰς στεφάνας ἔχον, οἱ δὲ μαχαίρας
 εἶχον χρυσείας ἐξ ἀργυρέων τελαμώνων

gänge der Verse 573-586 (Aufzug der Herde auf die Weide, Überfall derselben durch zwei Löwen) auf einem Bilde zu vereinigen waren, ist nicht recht einzusehen.'

582. βοείην. The correct form is βοέην, as ἀλωπεκέη ἀρνέη κυνέη λεοντέη λυκέη παρδαλέη, it exists in v2, where βοείην would upset the rhythm

586. ὑλάκτεον It recurs in v13 and 16, verses which are spurious
 The homeric form is ὑλάω

588. ὄϊων μέγαν So Heyne, as demanded by the metre Mss μέγαν οἰῶν

589. κατρεφέας Rather κατερεφέας, for a preposition does not generally prolong the initial vowel of the second constituent See note on v. 512

590 to 606 Spurious According to Faesi-Franke it was Clemens (De Homeri clypeo Achilleo, Bonn 1844) who first pointed out as

a whole their non-homeric character The same critics remark that the poet had already depicted dances in vv 494 and 571

591 and 592 *Institios esse et senioris autoris plurima demonstrant, primum forsitan Cretensi exemplari insertos, atque inde in alia propagatos* χορὸς et hic et alibi apud poetam est *locus saltationis*, non *sallatio*, quod interpolator non percepisse videtur, ejusmodi enim loci vacui vel areae anaglyphum e maiore a Pausania memoratum [7.4.5] et Daedalo tributum vix simile esse potuit, neque poetae aetate id extitisse probabile est, neque, si extitisset, ratio constaret qua ille, apud Asiae incolae carmina recitans, ex anaglypho in insula longinqua posito, atque auditoribus plerisque si non omnibus ignoto, illustrationem proferret in Homericis enim comparationes ad illustrandas potius quam ad ornandas res narratas adhibitae sunt ΠΑΥΝΕ KNIGHT

592 Ἀριάνη I e Ἀριάνη = ἀρι (ἀριπρεπής) + ῥαδ (ῥαδάνω) + νη The last constituent, found in Ἀθήνη Ἑρμιόνη Κυλλήνη and many other names, was primitively a derivative of νάω, as is shown by κρήνη (= κρή + νάω = *fountainhead*), and a suffix of names of Nereids or Naiads

593 ἀλφεσίβοιαι This should be ἀλφεσίβιαι, *bread-nourished*, the second part being from βίος

594 ὥρχευντ' A non-homeric form, see note on v. 24 Were the verse genuine, I should have suggested μέλποντ', cf 606 μολπήs Π182 μελομένησιν ἐν χορῶ

596 ἐνήτους ἦκα στίλβοντας ἐλαίῳ. No meaning in ἦκα στίλβοντας The interpolator may have written ἐνήτους λευκοὺς, στίλβοντας ἐλαίῳ, cf γ408 λευκοί, ἀποστίλβοντες ἀλείφατος St Mark 9-3 ἱμάτια στίλβοντα λευκά

597 and 598 Ἀθετοῦνται ὅτι οὐδέποτε μάχαιραν εἶπε τὸ ξίφος καὶ οὐ πρεπον χορεύοντας μαχάρας ἔχειν SCHOLIA The custom of wearing daggers whilst dancing still survives in Crete, where I have myself seen several dances The custom is invariable The daggers are stuck in the belt.

597. καὶ β(α) An impossible combination.

Οἱ δ' ὅτε μὲν θρέξασκον ἐπισταμένοισι πῶδεσσι ῥεῖα μάλ', ὥς ὅτε τις τροχὸν ἄρμενον ἐν παλάμῃσιν	600
ἐζόμενος κεραμεὺς πειρήσεται αἶ κε θέησιν, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖθρέξασκον ἐπὶ στίχας ἀλλήλοισι	603
Πολλὸς δ' ἱμερόεντα χορὸν περιύσταθ' ὁμιλος τερπόμενοι Δοῖω δὲ κυβιστητῇρε κατ' αὐτοὺς	606
Ἐν δ' ἐτίθη ποταμοῖο μέγα σθένης Ὀκεανοῖο ἄντυγα παρ' ἄκρην σάκεος πύκα ποιητοῖο.	
Ἄτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τεύξε σάκος μέγα τε στιβαρόν τε, τεύξ' ἄρα ροι θώρηκα φαεινότερον πυρὸς αὐγῆς,	610
τεύξε δέ ροι κόρυθα βριαρὴν κροτάφοισ' ἀραρυάν καλὴν δαιδαλέην, ἐπὶ δὲ χρύσειον λόφον ἦκε τεύξε δέ ροι κνημίδας ἑανοῦ κασσιτέριοι	
Ἄτὰρ ἐπεὶ πάνθ' ὅπλα κάμε κλυτὸς ἀμφιγυνοίς, μητρὸς ἄρ' Ἀχιλῆος θῆκε προπάροιθεν αἰέρας·	615
ἡ δ' ἔρηξ ὥς ἄλτο κατ' Ὀλύμπου νιφθέντος τεύχεα μαρμαρόεντα παρ' Ἠφαίστοιο φέρουσα.	

599 θρέξασκον The interpolator forgot to say that the men moved round as the simile from the potter's wheel implies.

605 κυβιστῶν et κυβιστητῇ ἁλίῃ et longè diversam significationem in Homericō sermone habuisse videntur PAYNE KNIGHT.

608 ἄντυγα παρ' ἄκρην I.e. ἄντυγος παρ' ἄκρον. *Near the (inner) edge of the rim.* Cf. E336 ἄκρην χεῖρα Θ83 ἄκρην καὶ κορυφὴν Z470 ἀκροτάτης κόρυθος, etc The triple rim represented as one Mss ἄντυγα πὰρ πυμάτην as if the outermost hoop were inside An attempt at eliminating the iamb

611. ἀραρυάν. Mss ἀραρυίαν

613 κνημίδας Mss κνημῖδας, see note v 459

614 ἐπεὶ πάνθ' ὅπλα κάμε, μητρὸς ἄρ' Ἀχιλῆος θῆκε Cf 609 ἐπεὶ δὴ τεύξε σάκος, τεύξ' ἄρα θώρηκα Mss μητρὸς Ἀχιλλῆος, see note on v 2

616. Ὀλύμπου. So vv. 79 142 167. Mss Οἰλύμπου with the usual fanciful extension of the initial vowel for metrical purposes.

617 μαρμαρέντα. Mss μαρμαίροντα, as also in v. 131. See note on v. 144.

Reverting to my note on v. 43, I have just seen that Bérard in a charming little book just published 'La Résurrection d'Homère' p. 90 connects the name Πρωτεύς with the Egyptian *Prouti*, I think myself that it is due to popular etymology from Τριτεύς, a duplicate of Τρίτων.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD
BY JOHN JOHNSON, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

